6.18.20.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 9941 .B3 1842
Balfour, Walter, 1776-1852.
Three inquiries

This Book may be useful to explain the meaning of some Original words, that illustrate certain passages of Scripture more fully than our received translation. But on the points it is designed to prove, particularly in part first, even admitting that it has succeeded in establishing them, which is not granted in all cases, It cannot be viewed correctly in many cases only as negative evidence; & therefore is of the same character as the argument of the Sadducees; "that because the writings of Moses did not directly allude to a future state, That therefore there is no Resurrection, or Life after Death."

X or Teach

GEORGE SEVERANCE.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/threeinquiries1i00balf

THREE

INQUIRIES.

1. Into the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the

DEVIL AND SATAN.

2. The Extent of Duration, expressed by the terms

OLIM, AION, AND AIONIOS,

RENDERED EVERLASTING, &c. &c. IN THE BIBLE,

AND ESPECIALLY WHEN APPLIED TO PUNISHMENT.

3. The New Testament Doctrine concerning the

POSSESSION OF DEVILS.

By WALTER BALFOUR,
OF CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

THIRD EDITION.

PROVIDENCE:
PUBLISHED BY Z. BAKER,
GOSPEL MESSENGER OFFICE.
1842.

Entered According to Act of Congress, in the year 1842, by
WALTER BALFOUR,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

Providence : Benjamin F. Moore, Book, Job, Card and Fancy Printer.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

INTRODUCTION - - - - - Page v.

SECTION I. Common opinions of the Devil and Satan briefly stated - - - - - 13

SECT. II. Remarks on Genesis iii. showing that the serpent which deceived Eve was not a fallen angel 19

SECT. III. All the texts in the Old Testement where the original word Shaitan, or Satan occurs, considered - - - - - 35

SECT. IV. The opinion that the Devil or Satan is a real being, with other connected opinions, shown to have their origin in heathenism - 64

SECT. V. All the passages in the New Testamen where the term Satan occurs, considered - - 97

SECT. VI. All the passages where the original word Diabolos, translated Devil is used, considered - 115

SECT. VII. All the passages considered in which the terms Devil and Satan are used synonymously - 146

SECT. VIII. All the texts considered where the Devil is supposed to be called the evil one, the tempter, the great dragon, the serpent, and old serpent, the prince of this world, the prince of the power of the air, and the god of this world - 161

SECT. IX. Facts stated, showing that the Devil is not a fallen angel, or a real being - - - 172

SECT. X. Objections considered - - - 182

SECT. XI. Concluding remarks, pointing out the evils which have arisen from the common opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan - - 190

PART II.

SECT. I. All the texts noticed where Olim occurs in the Old Testament, but is rendered by words which do not express or imply endless duration 197

SECT. II. All the passages noticed where Olim is used, and rendered by words which convey the idea of endless duration - - - 203

SECT. III. All the texts where Olim occurs, is rendered by words which convey the idea of endless duration, and applied to punishment, particularly considered - - - - - 233

SECT. IV. General remarks on Aion and Aionios, as used in the New Testament - - - 243

SECT. V. All the places noticed where Aion and Aionios are rendered ages, course, never, forever, evermore, eternal, everlasting; but which have no relation to punishment - - 253

SECT. VI. All the places where Aion and Aionios are rendered world, considered - - 265

SECT. VII. All the places where Aion and Aionios are used to express the duration of punishment, particularly considered, in whatever way rendered in the common version - - - 309

SECT. VIII. Concluding remarks on Olim, Aion and Aionios, throughout the Bible, whether applied to God, to life, or punishment - - - 343

PART III.

AN INQUIRY into the possession of devils mentioned in the New Testament - - - - - - - - 357

INTRODUCTION.

In presenting the following pages to the public, were any apology necessary, I would make it in the words of Professor Stuart to Dr. Miller. He says, p. 12, 13. of his Letters, "It is just as much our individual duty now, to bring every principle of the creed of the Protestant churches to the test of the divine word, as it was the duty of the Reformers to bring that of the Catholics to the test of Scripture. This position is absolutely certain; unless we can prove that the formers of the Protestant symbols were inspired. If they were not, they may have *erred* in some things; and if so, it is important to us, if possible, to know in what they have erred. But how shall we, or how can we know this, unless their creeds are subjected, anew and repeatedly, to the test of the Scriptures, &c.

"So long as we profess to be Protestants, and of course, profess to believe that the Bible is the *sufficient and only* rule of faith and practice, so long, if we act consistently, we believe in the symbols of faith which we receive, *only* because we find them supported by the Scriptures. It is not only lawful then to put them to the test; but it is an imperious duty for every man to do it, who is able to do it. There may be a show of modesty and humility in receiving what others have believed, without examination and without scrutiny; but in every case, where there is ability to investigate and bring to the Scripture test, a failure to do it must arise from undue regard to the authority of fallible men, or from mere inaction—from absolute sloth." &c.

According to my ability I have endeavored to bring to the Scripture test three very important articles in the Protestant creeds. Other articles, particularly those noticed in Part 1. Section iv. intruded themselves in the course of my researches, and it was deemed proper to give them a due share of attention, being very closely connected with my subject.

It may be thought by some, that if the things stated in Part i. Sect. 4. be true, the Second Part is a superfluous discussion; for it follows, of course, that endless punishment cannot be true. This we admit; but the texts where *everlasting* is applied to punishment, will not be given up by many as teaching endless punishment, until some rational Scriptural interpretation is presented, showing that their former views of them are incorrect.

I here can speak from experience; for I never would have relinquished the doctrine of endless punishment, unless I had come to see how such texts could be fairly explained as not teaching it. I have felt the power of such previous views on my own mind, and make allowance for others in the same condition. On this account, if my explanations of the texts where everlasting is applied to punishment be correct, the Second Part, so far from being superfluous, is highly necessary. Many of my former friends have wondered, how I could embrace my present views with such texts staring me in the face. One object with me, in the Second Part has been, to show, that I did not shut my eyes to these texts, but obtaining very different views of them, embraced my present opinions. Whether my present views be correct, they can now see and judge for themselves. If I have embraced error, they are requested to have the goodness to correct it.

In the following pages, we have expressed our opinions frankly and sincerely, and appealed to the Scriptures as the test of truth. The author hopes, that the spirit in which his remarks are made can give offence to none. He has studied to avoid all harsh language, convinced that man's wrath can never work the righteousness of God. If he has in any instance turned aside from this path, he shall regret it much more than any of his readers, for his object is to convince, not to irritate. Should it be said, some of the opinions controverted are not held now by our orthodox brethren, nor durst any preacher avow them, without forfeiting his station. We are glad to hear of this, but doubt if it is generally true; and certainly, we have never heard, that any public disavowal of them has been made. If such opinions are not held now, why not publicly denounce them? For it will not be denied, that they have been held by Calvinists in past ages. At any rate, we would say, it has been far from our heart to misrepresent the opinions of our brethren.

Should any one reply to the following pages, the author begs leave to say, that it will be of no consequence to point out defects in his manner of discussing the subject, or, to show that he has misunderstood some texts which have come under his consideration. As to the first, had his time and avocations permitted, he might have rendered the work freer of defects. As to the last, though he has used all means in his power to interpret the Scriptures correctly, yet it would be surprising, if in no instance he had misunderstood the sacred writers. A reply merely bearing on these points, he will pass over in silence. But, he will listen with attention to whatever may be advanced. He will attend to argument and evidence drawn from Scripture, come from what quarter they may, whether stated in a good or bad temper of mind. If convinced he is wrong, he will be silent, but if not, he will claim the privilege of stating his reasons for his dissent. Who-

ever undertakes to reply, we beg of them to give us *proofs* and not mere *assertions*, for what they may advance, and to pay particular attention also to what we have advanced in Part i. Sect. 4. To point out defects, without fairly meeting the grand points at issue will be considered no answer.

I make no apology for availing myself of quotations from various authors in the course of my remarks, for they are chiefly taken from writers whose religious creeds embraced the opinions controverted. None of them are taken from professed Universalists, for by most people their testimony would be deemed exceptionable, however well supported by evidence. The testimonies quoted in favor of my opinions, are from men competent to judge, and in high repute as critics and commentators among orthodox people. They are quoted, not to give sanction to my views by the weight and number of their names, but on account of the evidence which they produce.

In the present work, the strongest texts in favor of endless punishment are considered, and attention given them in proportion to the degree of stress laid on them in favor of this doctrine. In some instances, we have referred to our former Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, for an illustration, which the reader will please consult. And in all cases, we hope the texts referred to, will be turned to and read, as they confirm or illustrate the sentiments advocated.

The author is deeply sensible, that the sentiments advanced are very unpopular, and will be condemned by many without a hearing. He is sorry for such persons on their own account; for this cannot stop the advance of light and knowledge in the present day, any more than sleeping all day can stop the sun in his course. If what I have advanced be true, it must prevail against all opposition, for great is the truth, and must prevail. If my sentiments are false, the sooner they are refuted, neglected, and forgotten, the better. If this can be done, it no doubt will be done, and to the doing of it we shall add our hearty amen.

NOTICE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

In this third edition, a third part is added—"On the possessions of devils mentioned in the New Testament." Those who complained of the want of this, in the two former editions, will here find it supplied. This addition has considerably increased the size of the book, being unwilling to abridge the other parts to make room for it. We have seen no reason to change our opinions, or to alter them, and of course they remain in this as in former editions. All the difference is, we have somewhat abridged the introduction, left out a few sentences and words of no importance to the argument, and made a few verbal alterations in the phraseology. But these are of so little importance, that we deem them hardly deserving this brief notice. We hope the work is improved, and is rendered more perfect by the addition made to it. In this addition, the subject is discussed very briefly from what it might have been, for we deemed it most profitable to confine our attention to the argument from Scripture. By this test we wish our sentiments to stand or fall. If they are unscriptural, no person hitherto has attempted to refute them from the Bible. The attempt ought to be made soon, to benefit me, for I shall ere long go the way of all the earth, and be beyond either men's praise or their blame. What thou doest then "do quickly" for "there is no work, nor device, nor wisdom in the grave."

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

SECTION I.

COMMON OPINIONS ENTERTAINED OF THE DEVIL AND SATAN BRIEFLY STATED.

THE opinions entertained, concerning a being called the Devil and Satan, are many. We shall give a brief summary of them under the following particulars:

1st. *The Unity of the Devil.* It is the common opinion, that there is but one being properly called *the devil.* The unity of God is not more certainly believed, than that the Devil or Satan is one. Though God is said by many to be three persons in one being, yet the devil has never been supposed to be more than one person in one being. Dr. Campbell, Dissert. 6. says, "nor can any thing be clearer from Scripture than that, though the *demons* are innumerable, there is but one devil in the universe."

2d. *The Origin of the Devil.* The common opinions about this are:—that he was originally, one of the angels of God in heaven. God did not create him a

devil, but he became so, by his own sin and rebellion. It is also believed, that he drew a multitude of the heavenly hosts into rebellion with him, who have shared his fate, are called his angels, and that he has become their chief. His sin is supposed to have been pride; but how, or about what it arose, we have never seen properly defined. The time is not ascertained when all this took place; but it must have been before Adam and Eve sinned, as he is said to have been their seducer. Supposing all this to be true, we can answer the long agitated question—"whence cometh evil?" It came from heaven. It originated among the holy angels of God. But how it could originate in heaven, and among such holy beings, I must leave for others to explain. Admitting such opinions true, I ask, if sin once originated there and among such beings, why may it not again, yea, often; and why not extend it to all the ransomed of the Lord? Why may they not all finally become devils by sin and rebellion against the Lord? What is the security given that nothing of a like nature shall ever take place again in heaven?

3d. *His expulsion from heaven and his place of abode since.* How long the devil maintained his place in heaven after he sinned, we have never seen stated. All agree, that he was cast out of heaven, but where he was cast to, and where his abode has been since, very various opinions are entertained. Some say he was cast down to *hell*, and has been there in chains of darkness ever since. Others allege, that his abode is in the air, or our atmosphere. The most general opinion is, that he walks about in our world like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, and will continue to do so until the consummation of all things. Some have thought, that he has his residence in the heart of every

wicked man, and is the cause of so much evil being devised by it. These opinions cannot all be true, which creates a suspicion they may all be false.

4th. *The nature and character of the Devil.* The devil is universally believed to be a *spirit.* God is not more certainly believed to be a good spirit, than *he* is believed to be an evil spirit. Not one good quality is supposed to be in his nature or character. On the contrary, every evil, and that in the highest degree, is found in him. He is a perfect compound of all that is evil, and the irreconcilable enemy of God and man. As he is incapable of being made better, it is believed he is so bad that he cannot be made worse. To say a person or thing is as bad as the devil, is saying the worst that can be said concerning them.

5th. *The extraordinary powers ascribed to him.*—Many people consider him almost omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent. He is supposed to know the thoughts, words, and actions of all men; that he is in all parts of the world at the same time; and effects things by his power, little inferior to God himself. God is the only being in the universe who is able to control him. He can assume any form, shape, or color; and though an angel of darkness, can transform himself into an angel of light. One would be almost led to think, he had greatly increased his powers by his sin and rebellion, for no good angel is ever represented as possessing such extraordinary powers as Christians ascribe to the devil. If his powers have been curtailed by his rebellion against God, what must they have been before it?

6th. *How the Devil is employed.* It would be an endless task to enumerate all the various work in which he is supposed to have engaged, since his expulsion

from heaven. One of the first things he engaged in, was to tempt our first parents to sin, and thereby ruined them and all their posterity. Ever since, he has been seducing every son and daughter of Adam to all kinds of sin, fomenting all sorts of mischief, and producing misery in our world. He is supposed to be walking about seeking whom he may devour, deceives the whole world, and accuses the very best of men before God. He infuses evil thoughts and desires into men's minds, and is ever ready to assist them in the execution of their wicked purposes, and the gratification of their sinful lusts and passions. He is supposed not only to inflict many severe bodily diseases, but to harrass the mind, so as to drive persons to distraction and suicide. He is believed to have been the cause of all Job's afflictions, to have bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity, and urged Judas on in his course of wickedness until he betrayed Jesus, and was finally led to hang himself. He is also allowed to blind men's minds about the gospel, and harden their hearts, and is at work in the heart of every child of disobedience. He not only picks up the seed of the word when sown, lest men should believe it and be saved, but those who do believe it, are the objects of his particular malice, whom though he cannot ruin forever, he is determined to render as miserable as possible. All wicked men are his, and his care is, to keep them under his power and dominion. Some marvellous accounts have been given, of his torturing and tormenting good people, and of some who sold themselves soul and body to him. At the stipulated time, he has come and carried them away bodily to hell. It is the belief of some, that at death, the devil carries off the souls of wicked men to the same place. Those who wish to inform themselves more fully may consult Boston's works,

Edwards, Jeremy Taylor, Godwin, and many other authors on this subject.

7th. *The various names by which he is designated.* What the devil's name was before he sinned in heaven we have never been able to ascertain ; but if we cannot ascertain who or what the devil is, it is not for want of names, which are supposed to distinguish him from every other being. He is called in Scripture, as many suppose, satan, the devil, the evil one, the tempter, the old serpent, the god of this world, the prince of this world, and the prince of the power of the air. These are his principal titles, with a few others which are of less consequence, and do not require any particular notice. He has also a great variety of vulgar names, which to put on paper, would only be to promote the laughter of fools, which is no object with me in writing. If such a being does exist, we are called to weep, rather than to laugh. If he does not, I wish soberly and seriously to expose such a false and pernicious opinion. We protest against the common use of such names in daily conversation, whether the people believe or disbelieve his existence. One thing we remark, that all such vulgar names are designed to designate a real being or fallen angel, by people who thus use them.

8th. *His endless existence and future prospects.* It is not only believed the devil does exist, but that he will forever exist, the same wicked and malignant being. It is the common opinion, that no Saviour has, or ever will be provided for him. He is considered beyond the limits of God's mercy. This door is forever closed to him, and his repentance and return to his former allegiance and happiness is considered utterly hopeless. Nor is it thought that he will ever desire it, but would scorn such a proposal ; for his mind is

made up, rather to reign in hell than serve in heaven. Some have held the opinion, he will finally be restored, but will be the last being in the universe, who shall be delivered from future misery.

But it is the general opinion, that however miserable the devil is, he has nothing better to hope for; nor is he concerned for his miserable condition. As God *cannot*, or *will* not alter it, so he disdains to complain, or to sue for mercy. With such an endless, dreary prospect of intolerable misery before him, yet he scorns to submit, and his stout heart, supported by malice and revenge, is consoled, that if God is to be his eternal tormentor, to the same duration he shall be the tormentor of a large portion of mankind.

Such is a brief summary of the common opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan, and are by some still preached to the world. It is true, the ancient zeal for such opinions has considerably abated, but still enough remains to prevent me from being a favorite with the religious public for calling them in question. From early life such opinions have been imbibed; they have been nourished and strengthened by religious instruction in after life; and from the universal influence of public opinion in their favor, people have been deterred from inquiring—*are they true?* But, let any sober-minded man sit down and seriously reflect on such opinions, and we think he must be satisfied they cannot all be true. They are at variance with each other, and some of them are incredible and literally impossible, unless the devil be nearly equal to God himself. When brought to the test of Scripture and examined, we think they will be found wanting; having no better foundation than the doctrine of witchcraft, which is now almost exploded. The evidence of this we hope will appear in succeeding Sections.

SECTION II.

REMARKS ON GEN. iii. SHOWING, THAT THE SERPENT WHICH DECEIVED EVE WAS NOT A FALLEN ANGEL.

In considering the Scripture doctrine concerning the devil and satan, Gen. iii. first claims our attention. Those who are not familiar with its contents will please turn to it, and read it. The common opinion is, that the serpent which deceived Eve, was a fallen angel, and is throughout the Bible called the devil and satan. This is taken for granted, and it will be considered vain and impious to call it in question. But I shall proceed to state facts and arguments, proving, that in whatever way this chapter ought to be understood, it gives no countenance to such opinions.

1st. Moses in the two preceding chapters of Genesis, makes no mention of an angel, who fell from heaven. If such an event had happened, he was either ignorant of it, was not authorised, or deemed it unnecessary to mention it. We may with equal truth assert, that God created the devil, as assert, that an angel had become so, from any thing Moses has said in these chapters. But ought not this to have been announced in them, if it be true, that he is spoken of in the third as the cause of the fall of man?

2d. It is a fact equally indisputable, that Moses in this account, does not say that the serpent was a fallen angel. It is from what he does say, that we can learn what he believed, and not from his silence on the sub-

ject. It is not easily conjectured, how such an opinion came to be inferred from this account. The circumstances related lead to a very different conclusion.—Observe the connexion between the second and third chapters. In chapter ii. 19, 20, it is said, "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every *beast of the field*, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam, to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field, but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him." The third chapter begins thus—"Now the serpent was more subtle than any *beast of the field* which the Lord God had made."—Any one reading these two passages, would conclude that the serpent was a beast of the field, which the Lord brought to Adam, and which he had named *serpent*. The connexion leads to this conclusion, unless we suppose God brought a fallen angel among the beasts of the field to Adam, and that he gave him this name. But it would be foolish to assert this.

Again, let it be observed, that the woman did not accuse a fallen angel as her deceiver, verse 13. God says to her—"What is this that thou hast done?" She answers him, "the serpent beguiled me and I did eat." Had either Eve or Moses believed such an evil being was the cause of her disobedience, would they have imputed it to a beast of the field? When God made inquisition, he traces the evil from Adam to the woman, and from the woman to the serpent, and here both stop. But had there been any other agent concerned, I ask, would either of them have stopped here? But again, Moses does not represent the serpent as a fallen angel in the punishment inflicted,

verses 14, 15. It is evident God calls the deceiver of Eve, *serpent*. If a fallen angel used this reptile as a cover for his deception, it is certain he is not accused of the crime, nor does he suffer any punishment. From any thing said in the account, we may as justly accuse the angel Gabriel of deceiving Eve, as a fallen angel, and the punishment inflicted, fell on, and was as much suited to the former as to the latter. Was this fallen angel to go upon his belly and to eat dust all the days of his life?

3d. But another fact is, Moses in no part of his writings, gives us any information about an angel who fell from heaven and had become a devil. Let any one read the five books of Moses, and he must be convinced, that such a being is not once mentioned by him under any name. Had Moses only recognized the existence of such an evil spirit, there might be some ground for supposing that he used the serpent as a tool to effect the deception of Eve. But his entire silence on this subject, throughout his whole writings, forbids such a supposition. For more than two thousand years then, such an evil being was unknown among men. Was Moses afraid to speak out on this subject? But pray, what temptation had he to conceal such information? Let any candid man say, if Moses knew such an evil being existed, had deceived Eve, was such an enemy to God and the human race, whether he would have been silent about him. Such an important article we might naturally expect, would be conspicuous in his writings. But will any man affirm that this is the case?

4th. Another fact strongly confirms all the preceding. No Old Testament writer says, Moses by the serpent, Genesis iii., meant a fallen angel.—They never speak of such a being by the name ser-

pent, so that all foundation for such a supposition is out of the present question. But I ask, had they believed as people do now, would this have been the case? It is true, there are some texts in the Old Testament, from which it has been concluded that such a being is called satan. These will be fully considered in the next Section. Here, let the reader only notice, that no Old Testament writer considered the serpent a fallen angel, the *devil* of Christians. They frequently use the term serpent, but never insinuate that a fallen angel used this reptile in deceiving Eve. For four thousand years, then, no such opinion seems to have been entertained by any sacred writer.

5th. What shows that the serpent, Genesis iii., was not a fallen angel is, in the Bible there are both allusions and direct references to the account of Eve's deception and the entrance of sin, but no intimation is given, that a fallen angel was the cause of either. We shall briefly notice the principal of them. Paul, 2 Cor. xi 3, says—"But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

Paul here calls the deceiver of Eve *the serpent*, as Moses did, but not a syllable escapes him, that the devil used this beast of the field as a cover for his deception. If this was the orthodox belief in Paul's day, he gave no sanction to it as an inspired teacher. He agrees with all the preceding sacred writers, in being silent about the *devil* seducing our first parents. But if Paul believed this doctrine, is it not strange, that in a direct reference to the deception of Eve by the serpent, he should give no intimation that such a wicked being was the principal agent? But again, Job says, chap. xxxi. 33—"If I covered my trans-

gressions as Adam by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom." But instead of the words, "as Adam," we have in the margin, "after the manner of men." But allowing the rendering in the text correct, Job gives us no hint that he believed an evil spirit was the cause of Adam's sin. Again, in Hosea vi. 7, it is said—"but they like men, (in the margin like Adam) have transgressed the covenant." But a more direct reference we have, Rom. v. 12—14.—"Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." Here Paul expressly declares, that by one *man*, and not by a fallen angel, sin entered the world. But again, he says, 1 Cor. xv. 22.—"for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." See also verses 45—49. But still, he does not say a word about the devil or a fallen angel having any concern with either sin or death by Adam. In 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14. the apostle directly alludes to the third chapter of Genesis.—"But Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." The apostle here says, Eve was deceived, but not a word about her being deceived by a fallen angel. He told us, 2 Cor. xi. 3, that the *serpent* beguiled her, and this is just what Eve said herself, "the serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."—Gen. iii. 13.

Such are the references made in Scripture, to the account given us by Moses in the third chapter of Genesis, except two or three passages, where we read of that

old serpent, the devil and satan. These will be considered in Section viii.

6th. But admitting such an evil spirit did exist, call him by what name you please, how is the character of God to be defended in not forewarning our first parents against his evil devices? It is evident, not a word of caution was afforded them. They have to learn his existence by the mischief he does them, and if God gives them information afterwards concerning him, it comes too late to be of any benefit to them. Was God ignorant of the fall of this angel from heaven? Or, could he be ignorant of his evil devices, and not foresee the ruin of our first parents by him? This is impossible. Are we then to conclude, God concealed the knowledge of such a being from them, that they might be seduced and ruined?—I should rather conclude that no such being existed, about which God could give them information. He did foresee the consequences of their being seduced, and he guarded them against the true tempter as we shall presently see.

7th. The fall of an angel from heaven, and becoming a devil, is certainly a very remarkable event. It is rendered more so, by its connexion with the fall of man, in making him a sinner, and entailing, according to many, eternal misery on his posterity. The very nature of the case leads us to think, that Moses would have related the fall of this angel, before he introduced the fall of man. But nothing like this is found, nor is the one related as having any connexion with the other. Moses says just as much about the ascent of a devil to heaven, and becoming a good angel, as he does about the fall of an angel from heaven, and becoming a devil; and the deception of Eve, is just as much ascribed to the former as to the

latter. Nor, does any later scripture writer teach the doctrine of a fallen angel, or ascribe the fall of man to his evil influence. But allowing the existence of such a being we would notice,

8th. There is no evidence in this account, that a fallen angel knew that one tree of the garden was prohibited, and it is not easy to understand how a mere serpent could know it. Did God inform the devil about the prohibition? Or was he present when it was given? It does not appear that Eve informed him, for the serpent began the conversation with her, and seems to have known all about it. This very circumstance, representing the serpent as perfectly acquainted with the prohibition, suggests that Moses merely used the serpent to represent something else, which will rationally account for this.

9th. Admitting for a moment, that the devil did assume the likeness of a serpent, how does this accord with the policy which this arch deceiver is supposed to possess? For his advocates affirm, he can assume a much more agreeable likeness than that of a vile, contemptible reptile. Besides, he does not seem to have chosen this appearance often since, for people represent him as appearing in various forms, but seldom if ever in that of a serpent.

10th. Unless we believe that Eve was on familiar terms with the devil, and knew that serpents spoke and reasoned in those days, she was more likely to be frightened than deceived. A speaking serpent, or the devil under this likeness, would terrify the most courageous female among us. But Eve showed no signs of fear, or even suspicion on this occasion. She conversed with the devil, or the serpent, with as much apparent composure, as she could have done with Adam. The common belief makes her, a perfect holy creature,

to fall before a temptation, and that by means of agents, which almost all her sinful posterity would have resisted. What man, what female, now, would be deceived into disobedience by a speaking serpent, or the devil under this likeness? If pure mother Eve could not resist such a temptation, how can it be expected her corrupt offspring can resist any temptation? All these things lead me to suspect, this account of the deception of Eve by a serpent, was intended to teach us something else; and that we are indebted to Milton, rather than Moses, for the common opinions entertained on this subject.

I shall now state for candid consideration my own opinion of this passage. We find it then said, chap. iii. 1—"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field."—The question is—What serpent did Moses mean? Chapter ii. 19, would lead us to conclude it was a beast of the field.—But it will be asked—What! could serpents speak and reason in those days? I answer, we have no evidence that they did. It will be asked, what then did he mean by the serpent? I would answer this by asking—*did not Moses in this account mean to inform us how Eve was deceived, and how sin was first introduced?* To this all will readily agree. Well, the serpent was *more subtle* than any beast of the field, and was the fittest creature which could be chosen to illustrate by a figure how Eve was deceived. Let it be recollected, Moses wrote this account more than two thousand years after it happened, and selects the serpent, celebrated for its subtilty among mankind. And why might not Moses select this creature as a figure for deception, as other scripture writers do the lion for ferocity, the lamb for meekness, and the dove for harmlessness?

It will be said, *allowing this to be true, what deceived Eve, and which Moses here represents by the subtilty of the serpent?* I answer, *lust* or *desire*.—That Adam and Eve were created with appetites or desires will not be questioned. They desired, or lusted after the fruit of the other trees of the garden, and ate of them. Nor would there have been any sin in lusting after and eating the fruit of the prohibited tree more than the others, but for the prohibition. It was this, and this alone, which could render it criminal. Before the prohibition was given, there was no sin in either. But this only provokes the question—How came Eve to desire the fruit of the prohibited tree? Answer; she could no more prevent herself having desires, than she could prevent herself being made, or made just such a creature with such appetites; and the very prohibition not to eat of this tree, was calculated to excite curiosity in her about it, and create desire after it. What man has not known the truth of this from experience? The evil did not lie in Eve's having appetites and desires, but her appetites and desires took occasion from the very prohibition, and in this way she was deceived and eventually sinned. What Paul says, Rom. vii. 7—11, Eve might have said, "I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust except the law had said thou shalt not eat. But sin taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For *sin, taking occasion by the commandment deceived me, and by it slew me.*" What does Paul here say *deceived* him? It was *sin taking occasion by the commandment*, or *desire*, which is the

origin of sin; for lust or desire, "when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin." James i. 15. So in regard to Eve. There could be no difference betwixt Paul and her, unless we suppose one of two things.—First, That Eve was created without lust or desire altogether, which was certainly not the case. Or, second, That she was incapable of desiring what God had prohibited. If so, then she would have been incapable of sinning. The event proved that she was not. It should ever be kept in view, that *sin* does not consist in having lust or desire, nor even in being tempted to gratify desire contrary to the commandment, but in complying with the temptation. Jesus Christ had desire, and was tempted, but resisted the temptation, as will appear in Section vii.

If the serpent then was more subtle than any beast of the field, it was the fittest creature which could be selected to show the *deceit* of lust. In this view, the whole dialogue between Eve and her own lust, is both striking and natural. The serpent, or Eve's lust after the fruit, says—"Yea, hath God said; ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Thus her lust takes occasion by the commandment to desire the fruit. But Eve knew the commandment, hence she replied to her lust—"We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." To this lust replied—"Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil." Permit me to ask, could any thing be more fitly chosen to describe the artful, plausible insinuations of lust or desire after some forbidden object? But the woman ceases to oppose her lust, by reasoning further

on the subject. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be *desired* to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." From its being said—"the woman *saw* that the tree was good for food," some have concluded, that she saw a serpent eat of the fruit, and no evil following, she concluded it must be good for her food also. If this is true, it was calculated to excite desire in her, and embolden her to proceed. It was also an additional reason for introducing the serpent into this account. If the word *saw*, is here used in the sense of *considered*, as is evidently its sense in some other parts of Scripture, she must then have *considered*, or inferred that the fruit was good for food, from seeing the serpent eat; or drew this conclusion, from looking at the fruit and the reasonings of her own lust or desire about it. The last I am inclined to think was the case. But let these things be as they may, it is certain the tree appeared pleasant to her eye, and *a tree to be desired to make one wise.* This her lust told her. All know lust is subtile and eloquent in its persuasions, and never fails to promise, that we shall be wiser and happier by its indulgence. Eve was overcome by the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eye. She eat, and gave also to her husband and he did eat. He hearkened to the voice of his wife, and thus "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was (first) in the transgression."—1 Tim. ii. 14.

It will likely be said, plausible as this appears, what evidence have we that Eve's lust is here represented by the serpent, and that this dialogue was between her and her own lust? The evidence which inclines me to this view of the subject I shall very briefly state.

1st. I find lust or desire stated in Scripture to be the source or origin of transgression. James says, ch. i. 15—"Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." See also chap. iv. 1, and other texts which I need not quote. The conceivings of lust after any object, never could bring forth sin, unless that object was prohibited. Paul says—"I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said thou shalt not covet." Rom. vii. 7. It is the doctrine of Scripture, and of common sense, that where there is no law, there can be no transgression. Allow me then to ask, must not lust in Eve have been the source of sin, just as it is in us? Can any good reason be assigned why it is now the source of sin in us but was not so with her?

2d. Sin, and lust the source of sin, are always represented in Scripture as *deceitful and beguiling*. Paul, Heb. iii. 13, speaks of the "*deceitfulness* of sin," and declares, Rom. vii. 11, that sin taking occasion by the commandment "*deceived*" him and slew him. And in Eph. iv. 22, he exhorts to put off "the old man, which is corrupt according to *the deceitful lusts*." And as all the conceivings of lust are in the heart, it is said —"the heart is *deceitful above all things*."—Jer. xvii. 9. The serpent then was more subtle than any beast of the field, and was just as fit to represent the deceit of lust, as the dove is to represent the quality of harmlessness, or the lamb that of meekness. Those familiar with the scriptures know, that many of the beasts of the field are used as figures, in a similar way, which it would be tedious to detail. For example: our Lord says, "be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves." And it is well known, that in Daniel and the book of Revelation, the writers deliver their prophecies under

the figure of beasts, and other symbols derived from the material world.

3d. In after parts of Scripture, the serpent is used, as a figure for cunning and deceit. The word rendered serpent in the account before us is *Nehesh*. Taylor says it signifies the "common snake. But in southern, hot, desert countries, the snakes may be larger or more venomous than in the cold northern climates." It is used literally for the snake or serpent, Job xxvi. 13, Eccles. x. 8, Prov. xxx. 19, Deut. viii. 15, Numb. xxi. 7, 9, Amos ix. 3, Jer. xlvi. 22, Mic. vii. 17, Jer. viii. 17, Eccles. x. 11, Amos v. 19, Numb. xxi. 6. The same word is used for the brazen serpent which Moses made, 2 Kings, xviii. 4, Numb. xxi. 9. Also for Moses' rod changed to a serpent, Exod. iv. 3, and vii. 15. It is used figuratively for tribes and nations, and to express a state of subjugation, degradation, &c. Gen. xlix. 17, Isai. xxvii. 1, Mic. vii. 17. Isai. lxv. 25. This word is also used figuratively, to set forth the deceit and lies of wicked men. Please consult the following passages. Psalms lviii. 3—5, and cxl. 1—4, Eccles. x. 11, Isai. xiv. 29, Prov. xxiii. 32. If the cunning and deceit of the serpent was learned by men from experience and observation, and was used figuratively for this purpose, why not also by Moses in this account, in showing how Eve was deceived by her own lust? Was it not just as proper a figure, to show how sin entered by the deceit of lust, as to illustrate its deceitfulness, in its progress among men afterwards? If lust is deceitful now, and if the serpent on account of subtlety is a proper figure to express it, at what date shall we fix the commencement of its deceit, and the use of this figure, if my view of this subject is controverted?

4th. The view given of Eve's deception by the ser-

pent, or her own lust, accords with every man's own experience. We all, like her, have appetites and desires, nor is it sinful to have them, or even to gratify them in the way, or to the extent God allows us. But I ask, where is the man to be found, who has not felt the conceivings of lust within him after some forbidden object? And can any man deny the subtle, deceitful influence, which lust has had over his reason and understanding? Yea, I appeal to every man, if something of a similar dialogue has not taken place with him and his own lust, as I have said took place between Eve and hers. Our consciences, if well informed, will reason and remonstrate against our desires, and in favor of obedience to the commandment. And can the man be found, who will affirm, that his lusts have never flattered him into disobedience? In the very best of men, the flesh has lusted against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and made them exclaim—"O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death."

5th. The view I have given of Eve's deception, accords with what is stated in the subsequent part of the chapter. The first thing stated is—"the eyes of them both were opened," as the serpent or lust had suggested to Eve, verse 5. They came to know evil as well as good by disobedience, but it did not add to their happiness and comfort as was expected. Does not every man find this, who yields to the flattery of his lusts, and transgresses the commandments of God?—But what deserves our notice is, the account to which the offenders are called. Adam is first called up, and asked—"What is this that thou hast done?" He answers—"the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat." The woman is next interrogated—"what is this that thou hast

done?" She answers—"the serpent beguiled me and I did eat." What serpent beguiled her? I have said her own lust taking occasion by the commandment beguiled her. Let us see how this view accords with the sentence pronounced on the serpent. God does not say to Eve's lust or the serpent—"what is this that thou hast done?" But—"because thou hast done this thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life."* The sentence is in accordance with the figurative use of the term serpent. It would have destroyed the congruity of the account to have done otherwise. Well, let us see how this sentence agrees to men's bodily appetites and desires, as figuratively expressed by the term serpent. We have said that man was created with bodily appetites, passions and desires. These were given him to be in subjection to God's will, and not gratified beyond the limits which he prescribed. Eve, listening to them beyond this limit, transgressed. In her, and all who have followed her example, when gratified beyond this they become degraded and groveling even below every beast of the field. The real bodily wants of man are few, and their supply easily obtained. But to his artificial, sinful desires, no boundaries can hardly be prescribed. These often are so low, and filthy, that no beast of the field is given to similar indulgencies. Men's lusts and passions—"are cursed *above* all cattle and above every beast of the field."—Like the natural serpent, dust or earthly gratifications

* It is not necessary to suppose here, as some have done, that the serpent before this walked upright, any more than that there was no rainbow before the flood. The rainbow was only used as a sign that God would not destroy the earth again with a flood; and the grovelling nature of the serpent to set forth what would afterwards be the state of men's bodily lusts or desires.

are their enjoyment, until the person is created anew in Christ Jesus, and is led to place his affection on things which are above. What shall I eat, and what shall I drink, are the questions in which our bodily desires centre, and to have goods laid up for many years, to eat, drink and be merry, are their happiness. But the account proceeds—"And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." The seed of the woman here is generally understood to refer to Christ. Well, what is the seed of the serpent? I answer sin, for "when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin." This agrees precisely to what Christ was manifested to do. "He was manifested to take away our sins." This will be shown in Sect. vi. The Jews, who were of their father the devil, bruised Christ, in crucifying him, but he by his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil. The enmity between the seed of the woman, and the seed of the serpent, is beautifully illustrated by such texts as the following: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts. Walk in the spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh," &c. To bruise a serpent's head is to kill it. And Christ before he delivers up the kingdom is to accomplish the entire destruction of this devil and all his works. See 1 Cor. xv. 24, &c. Heb. ii. 14, 15, with many other texts.

I shall only add, to represent Eve as holding a dialogue with her own lust, can create no difficulty to persons familiar with their Bible. The beasts of the field, and trees of the wood, are in the figurative language of Scripture represented as holding conversation together. Nor is the Bible wanting in examples of persons hold-

ing dialogues with themselves. But I must suppress many additional remarks, which I intended to make on the first three chapters of Genesis, as the remarks already made, exceed the limits assigned to this part of the subject.

SECTION III.

ALL THE TEXTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, WHERE THE ORIGINAL WORD SHAITAN, OR SATAN OCCURS, CONSIDERED.

THE passages where the term *satan* occurs in the Old Testament, are now to be brought forward, and we urge it on the reader to observe, if satan is a fallen angel, the serpent which deceived Eve, as is very generally asserted. We shall take up the passages, in the order they occur in the common version. Taylor, Parkhurst, and all critics declare, that the word *satan* signifies, "*an adversary.*" In this sense it was understood by our translators, for this is their usual rendering of it, as we shall see immediately. It occurs then first as a noun feminine.

Gen. xxvi. 21. "And they digged another well, and strove for that also: and he called the name of it *sitnah.*" If the term *satan* be the name of a fallen angel, it is strange the sacred writers should first apply it to a well. Had the existence of such a being been previously announced, it might be supposed he was the cause of the strife about this well, and on account of which it received this name. But nothing like this is

to be found. The well is called *sitnah*, or *satan* in the text, and we have *hatred* in the margin as its explanation. Hatred is the act of an adversary, and the context sufficiently shows why it received this name.

Numb. xxii. 22, 32. "And God's anger was kindled, because he (Baalam) went: and the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an *adversary* against him.—And the angel of the Lord said unto him, wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? Behold I went out *to withstand thee*, because thy way is perverse before me." The word *satan* in the original occurs twice, and is here rendered by the words *adversary*, and, *to withstand thee*. In the margin of the last verse we have, "*to be an adversary unto thee*." It is obvious, that the *satan* or *adversary* who withstood Baalam, instead of being a fallen angel, was the angel of Jehovah. It is then a remarkable fact, that the first time the term *satan* is applied to any being in the Bible, it is to a good being. But this is concealed from the reader, by rendering the word satan, *adversary*. It may be observed here, and the remark applies to other texts, that had the original word been always retained in the text, or had it been uniformly rendered *adversary*, we would have been less liable to mistaken views on this subject. Had the first been done, we must have recurred to the context and scope of the writer to ascertain what he meant by *satan;* and if a being, what being was referred to. It would have been easily perceived, some human adversary was referred to, or the angel of Jehovah, as in the passage before us. But the word satan being sometimes retained in the text, and sometimes rendered adversary, the common Scripture usage of this word is not perceived. Besides, people from education and habit, have attached the idea of a fallen angel to the word

satan, which always suggests the idea of such a being. But not so with the word adversary, which is its rendering in many passages. Accordingly, it is on the texts where the term satan is left untranslated, that people have built their faith about a fallen angel. This idea has been associated with the word in their minds from childhood, and it is next to impossible to effect a separation. The term *satan* will suggest it, and the meaning of the word, its scripture usage, and the context of the places where it occurs, are not sufficient to destroy it. Commencing the study of the Bible with this false idea, all must see how many texts may be perverted, not from design, but from the influence of this false association. We know of no better way to correct it than to recur to the original sense of the term satan, and examine all the places where it occurs, with their respective contexts.

Should it be asked—why did not the translators of our English version either render this word always *adversary*, or uniformly leave the term *satan* untranslated? I answer: had they always rendered it adversary, they could not so easily have infused into their version the idea of a fallen angel. Had they always retained the original word, its application to the angel of Jehovah, human beings and things would have led people to conclude that it did not designate such an evil being. King James, under whose patronage the version was made, not only believed that satan was a fallen angel, but he wrote in defence of the doctrine of witchcraft.

1 Sam. xxix. 4. "And the princes of the Philistines said unto him, make this fellow return, that he may go again to his place which thou hast appointed him, and let him not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he be an *adversary* to us." Here again the term *satan*

is rendered *adversary*, and it is evident from the context, that David, not a fallen angel is meant. Nor, need this surprise us, seeing the angel of Jehovah was called so in the preceding passage. Many people do not know this, but it would have been evident had our translators, as in other places, left the term *satan* untranslated. This is the first place in the Bible where the word *satan* is applied to a human being, and it is applied to a man who feared God. It need not then surprise us, that our Lord called Peter satan, and Judas a devil. It is very obvious, the idea of a fallen angel attached to the word satan, is calculated to mislead us, for this term is used to designate the very best of created beings.

2 Sam. xix. 22. "And David said, what have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruiah, that ye should this day be *adversaries* unto me." Here the term satan is used in the plural, and is rendered *adversaries*. The *satans* referred to, are expressly called the sons of Zeruiah. Wicked men they might be, but no one supposes they were fallen angels. Besides, it is commonly believed, there is but one being in the universe which goes by this name, yet here we find the term used in the plural and applied to men. In the New Testament we read of *demons*, and of a person possessed with a legion of them. But David does not say the sons of Zeruiah were demons, or possessed with demons or satans, but that they were *satans* to him. This shows clearly, the term simply means an adversary, and was the sense David attached to it. We seldom if ever use it in the plural, for the unity of satan is the common belief as much as the unity of God.

1 Kings v. 4. "But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, so that there is neither adversary nor evil occurrent." Here the term *satan*

is used in the singular, and is again rendered *adversary*. Solomon does not name, as in the preceding text, any person referred to, but the scope of the context evidently shows, that he had in view, human beings, who were accustomed to be *satans* or *adversaries* to Israel. David had many such *satans* to contend with during his reign, but now Solomon had none of them to disturb the peace of his kingdom. He therefore determined to build an house to the Lord, which his father was prevented from doing by his frequent wars with them. We shall soon see that Solomon was not altogether free from his troubles from such satans or adversaries.

1 Kings xi. 14, 23, 25. "And the Lord stirred up an *adversary* unto Solomon; Hadad the Edomite: he was of the king's seed in Edom. And God stirred him up another *adversary*, Rezon, the son of Eliadah, which fled from his lord Hadadezer, King of Zobah. And he was an *adversary* to Israel all the days of Solomon, beside the mischief that Hadad did: and he abhorred Israel and reigned over Syria." In these verses the word *satan* is used three times, and is uniformly rendered *adversary*. The term is applied to human beings, who are distinctly named, Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the son of Eliadah. The last was a satan to Solomon all his days. It would be ridiculous to suppose the term satan here, had any reference to a fallen angel; for the in first case it would be to make him an Edomite, and in the second the son of Eliadah, and that he was called Hadad and Rezon as well as satan. It is of more importance to observe, *God stirred up* those satans against Solomon. Had only one satan been mentioned, and no name given to show who was particularly meant, it is likely some would have concluded, that God stirred

up a fallen angel against him. But here, it is put beyond all controversy, that *satan* has no reference to a fallen angel. We would then ask, ought not such texts, where the circumstances mentioned, so clearly decide that this term designates no such being, to teach us caution in concluding that this is its meaning in any passage? When the word satan is introduced, and no circumstances are mentioned clearly to decide who or what is meant, is it rational or scriptural to say a fallen angel or wicked spirit must be meant? We should think not; and until it is satisfactorily proved, that such a being does exist, no rational man would ever think of such a conclusion.

1 Chron. xxi. 1. "And satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." Here, for the first time, the word *satan* is left untranslated; but I can perceive no good reason why it was not rendered *adversary*, as it is in other places. No evidence appears from the text or context, that a fallen angel or wicked spirit provoked David to number Israel. If the rule in other cases be allowed here, plain passages ought to interpret doubtful and obscure ones, and common scripture usage of a word, ought to determine in particular cases in what sense the sacred writers used it. It is then determined here, for no previous scripture writer has said any thing about a fallen angel, or used the word satan in reference to such a being. Supposing they had done this, it would not be safe to conclude he was spoken of, for the term satan is applied to human beings in preceding passages, which might be the case here. In every text the question ought to be, what satan or adversary is intended? As the word is not translated, and the idea of a fallen angel is associated with it in people's minds, and nothing directly being said to the

contrary, it is concluded that this being provoked David to number Israel. Though the labor of proving this belongs to them, yet I shall offer the following proof to the contrary.

1st. If the term satan designates, in this passage, a fallen angel, it is the first time we hear any thing concerning such a being in the Bible, under this or any other name. But it is evident *satan* is not here introduced as a new and extraordinary being, nor is there any evidence that the word is used in a different sense from what it is in the passages already considered. To believe his existence from the text, is not only implicit faith, but in face of evidence to the contrary, arising from scripture usage of the word, and the silence of all preceding writers about such a being.

2d. Had the word *satan* been rendered *adversary*, previous scripture usage would have led us to conclude, one of David's enemies had menaced him with a new war, and thus provoked him to number Israel. It should be remembered, that the strength of Israel did not consist in the multitude of their armies, but their confidence in Jehovah and obedience to his laws. In numbering Israel, David sinned greatly, as it intimated a removal of his trust from God to that of the number and strength of his forces. It has been thought by some that David's sin consisted in his wishing to establish a military government for conquest, hence gave orders to enrol all Israel for this purpose.

3d. But what in this passage is ascribed to satan, is in 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, ascribed to God. "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, go number Israel and Judah." We are sure that God tempts no man

to evil, James i. 13. Should it be said God permitted satan, a fallen angel, to do it, we ask where is the proof of this? The passage affords none, except the gratuitous sense affixed to the term *satan*, which signifies an adversary. To say it here means a fallen angel, is not only begging the question, but is opposed to all former scripture usage of this word.

4th. When David's heart smote him for his sin, he imputes no part of the blame either to satan or God. No, he says—"I have sinned greatly because I have done this thing." 1 Chron. xxi. 8. Nor, do we find that satan suffers any part of the punishment, or is threatened with any. Others suffered severely for his sin, but if satan was the chief cause of all this evil, why does he escape all punishment? David does not plead his influence in mitigation of his offence, or the punishment it incurred. But if either God or a fallen angel moved David to commit this sin, why did no blame attach to them?

5th. But some orthodox critics declare, that there is no reference to such a being in this passage. Parkhurst says, on this word; "I would understand it, 1 Chron. xxi. 1, of a *human adversary:* compare 2 Sam. xxvi. 1, which perhaps may be best rendered; and again the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Israel, and David was moved against them by (one's) saying, or rather indefinitely, and one moved David against them saying, go number Israel and Judah." See Dr. Chandler's Life of King David. Farmer, on Christ's Temptation, quoting from Dr. Chandler, says, "for, speaking of David's numbering the people, he says, *if the Devil had bid him do it, I suppose he might have seen the cloven foot, and would scarce have followed the measure for the sake of the adviser.*"

Ezra iv. 6. "And in the reign of Ahasuerus, in the

beginning of his reign, wrote they unto him an *accusation* against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem." In this text the word satan is a noun feminine and is rendered *accusation*. Notice, it is not the persons who wrote who are called satan, but the thing written. The persons who wrote, were, properly speaking, the satan, or adversary, yet it is the written document, sent by them to Ahasuerus, which is called *satan*, for it was not them but it, which was to appear before the king as the accuser or adversary of the Jews. Who the persons were we learn from verses 1—6. "The people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah and troubled them in building. And hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, king of Persia." But we are told that "in the reign of Ahasuerus in the beginning of his reign," they wrote to him, and this writing is called a *satan* or *accusation*. The term satan, then, so far from being the appropriate name of a fallen angel, is applied to men's evil passions, the angel of Jehovah, human beings, and here to a piece of writing.

Job i. 6—13, and ii. 1—11, comes next to be considered. To save room I forbear transcribing these two passages. The reader can easily read them. The term *satan* occurs here fourteen times, but is uniformly left untranslated. It is rendered, in the Seventy's version, by the word *diabolos*, devil. Here, say many good people, satan must mean a fallen angel—"for the name, the things said to be done, and all the circumstances mentioned, go to prove his existence and wicked character." We frankly admit, that these two passages have more the appearance of teaching this doctrine, than all the other texts adduced as proof of it. We admit, if the devil

of Christians is taught in the Bible, this is the place. We hope then, that they are willing to abide by the result.

I have examined these two chapters, with all the care and attention I could command, and shall submit the result for candid consideration, by stating and answering the following questions:

1st. Who wrote the book of Job? Answer; about this there are various opinions. Some have ascribed it to Job himself. Others to Elihu or one of the prophets. The general opinion has been, that it was written by Moses, and composed from materials left by Job or his friends in the Syriac or Arabic language. See Gray's Key.

2d. When was the book of Job written? Answer; It is generally agreed that it was written sometime between the death of Joseph and the delivery of the law at Sinai. It is perhaps impossible for us to fix its precise date. Nor is this important in our present investigation. Those who wish to see the various opinions entertained concerning this, may consult Gray's Key, pp. 229—258.

3d. Was Job a real or only a fictitious person? Answer; some have held the latter opinion. I think Job was a real person; for in after parts of scripture his afflictions are represented as real afflictions, and his patience under them as an example to us. He is spoken of just as Noah and Daniel are. One of the sons of Issachar is called Job, Gen. xlvi. 13, and was one of Jacob's grandchildren, who went down with him into Egypt. If this was the person who forms the subject of the book of Job, it fixes, generally, the period in which he lived.

4th. Is every thing in the book of Job to be understood literally, or is any allowance to be made for em-

bellishment or allegorical representation? Answer; although I think Job was a real person, yet many things are set forth in the way of allegory. For example, God is not only represented as talking with *satan*, but as influenced by him to bring accumulated sufferings on a just man without cause. These are brought in such rapid succession, too, as seldom occurs among men. Besides, there seems something studied and artificial; that only one servant should make his escape to tell Job what had happened, and before he is well done, only one more makes his escape to bring additional evil tidings. And just as he closes his speech, a third also in like manner, and a fourth in the same way arrives, and closes the first scene of Job's calamities. Besides, throughout the whole book, there is something very studied and artificial in the set speeches of Job and his friends, and even of God himself at the close. The writer gives Job just double the number of camels, oxen, sheep, and asses, without one more or less, which he had at the beginning. And he gives him precisely the same number of sons, and the same number of daughters, as at the first. And finally leaves Job in a more prosperous condition than before his afflictions came upon him, with a long life of enjoying his prosperity. The book concludes without any notice of the removal of Job's disease, which by some is called *elephantiasis*, and was deemed by physicians incurable. Had the whole been matter of fact, and nothing in it allegorical, we hardly think such artificial statements could have been given.

5th. In what part of the world were the scenes of the book of Job laid? Answer; we are told, chap. 1: 1, that—"there was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job." That this was in Chaldea or its

neighborhood, is almost certain, for the Chaldean robbers or freebooters are said to have carried away Job's flocks, chap. i. 17. Dr. Parish, in his Sacred Geography, says—"Bochart and the authors of the Universal History, and some others place the land of Uz far south from Damascus, and almost directly east from the tribe of Reuben, and west from Chaldea, in Arabia Deserta." But see his work on the word Uz, for other opinions about this. See, also, Gray's Key, as referred to above. It is not of essential importance, to determine the precise spot where Job lived. It is sufficient for our purpose that he lived in the east. See Job 1:3.

6th. What were the religious opinions of the people where the scenes of the book are laid? Answer; This is a point of very great importance to ascertain. Orthodox men who certainly did not write to favor my opinions shall furnish us with all necessary information. Prideaux, in his Connexions, vol. 1. pp. 185—6, thus writes: "Directly opposite to these were the Magians, another sect, who had their original in the same eastern countries; for they, abominating all images, worshipped God only by fire. They began first in Persia, and there, and in India, were the only places where this sect was propagated; and there they remain even to this day. Their chief doctrine was, that there were two principles, one which was the cause of all good, and the other the cause of all evil, that is to say, God and the devil; that the former is represented by light, and the other by darkness, as their truest symbols; and that, of the composition of these two, all things in the world are made: the good god they name Yazdan, and also Ormudz, and the evil god, Ahraman: the former is, by the Greeks, called Oramasdez, and the latter Ari-

manius. And therefore, when Xerxes prayed for that evil upon his enemies, that it might be put into the minds of all of them to drive their best and bravest men from them, as the Athenians had Themistocles, he addressed his prayers to Arimanius the evil god of the Persians, and not to Oramasdez, their good god. And concerning these two gods there was this difference of opinion among them, that, whereas some held both of them to have been from all eternity, there were others that contended, that the good god only was eternal, and that the other was created. But they both agreed in this, that there will be a continual opposition between those two till the end of the world; that then the good god shall overcome the evil god, and that from thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself, that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil god his world with all evil men with him; that darkness is the truest symbol of the evil god, and light the truest symbol of the good god. And therefore, they always worshipped him before fire, as being the cause of light, and especially before the sun, as being in their opinion the perfectest fire, and causing the perfectest light. And for this reason, in all their temples, they had fire continually burning on altars erected in them for that purpose. And before these sacred fires they offered up all their public devotions, as likewise they did all their private devotions before their private fires in their own houses. Thus did they pay the highest honor to light, as being in their opinion the truest representative of the good god; but always hated darkness, as being, what they thought, the truest representative of the evil god, whom they ever had in the utmost detestation, as we now have the devil: and, for an instance hereof, whenever they had

an occasion, in any of their writings, to mention his name, they always wrote it backward, and inversed, as thus, uɐɯɐɹqʌ."

That such were the religious opinions of the people where Job lived, we should think indisputable, to whatever result it may lead. Ahraman or Arimanius, the evil principle deified, was the evil god of the people. The only objection which will be stated against this is—"That Job lived at too early a period for the opinions advanced in this quotation." But in answer I would remark first, that Job's day was not too early for Sabianism or the worship of idols, for this existed in Abraham's day: and when Israel entered Canaan the worship of idols prevailed among the inhabitants. Prideaux speaks of Sabianism, as *opposite* to Magianism, but does not intimate that the former was of a more ancient date. On the contrary, we shall see in the next Section, that when Zoroaster arose and revived the Magian religion he revived that, which for "many ages" had been the established religion of Persia. In this account *satan* is not represented as a new or extraordinary being, who had never been heard of before. It is taken for granted that the people where the scenes of the book are laid, were familiar with such a being, and the opinions expressed concerning him. This account, which appears strange to us, they needed no explanation of, any more than people among us do, when any man preaches about the devil.

But what shows such opinions prevailed where Job lived, are the facts and circumstances mentioned in the account itself. These we shall notice presently. Here I would only say, that it is evident satan is introduced as an evil being, and it is generally contended that he was the author of all Job's afflictions. This

perfectly agrees to the opinions of the Magians, as stated by Prideaux. Besides, previous scripture usage of the term satan, forbids us thinking, that the sacred writers recognised either an evil god or a fallen angel under this name. Where, let me ask, do any of them intimate, that an evil being, such as the Persian evil god, or the Christian's devil, existed as a rival to Jehovah? To what else then could the writer refer, but to such heathen opinions? If such a being as the Christian's devil existed, how is it accounted for, that he remained so quiet until the days of Job? Job appears to have been the first man he ever troubled. Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with many others were good men, and rich men, but he never attempted to injure them in their property, or smite them with a single boil in their whole lifetime. From any thing which appears to the contrary, they had no fear of such a being, nor knew of his existence. Had satan just fallen from heaven, in the days of Job, and began his depredations on mankind? Admitting this true, how is it, that as Job was the first, so he was the last man he ever so tormented? The case of the woman, whom he is said to have bound eighteen years, is no exception to this, as we shall show, Section v. Let it be accounted for then, why satan had such a particular hatred against Job, above all other men before or since. It is easily perceived, these things are rationally accounted for, on the presumption, that in this account there is a reference to the evil god of the people among whom Job lived. Allowing this, the account is just what might be expected. The character given to *satan*, answers to that of their god, whom they believed to be the author and director of all evil.

The question which now comes forward for consideration, is—Was this account of satan introduced

for the purpose of establishing, or was it introduced to refute such opinions? Let satan here be considered, either the evil principle deified, or the devil of Christians, were such opinions intended to be sanctioned by the writer, or does he introduce them, to expose their fallacy, and establish the supremacy of the one living and true God in opposition to them? All, I think, will agree that the whole must stand approved or condemned. No middle path can be here taken, for no ground is afforded for it. It is then a matter of no consequence, whether we consider satan in this account the principle of evil deified, or, that he was the Christian's devil. Whether the same or different, I shall proceed to show, by direct and I think conclusive evidence, that neither of them had any influence in producing Job's afflictions. That they were all sent by the one living and true God, whom Job feared and obeyed, is evident.

1st. From Job's own testimony concerning his afflictions. Job's heathen neighbors supposed their evil god Ahraman was the cause of them. Christians believe their satan or devil was the cause of them. But does Job ascribe them to either? No; when one messenger after another is represented as announcing to him the loss of his property and at last the death of his children, he says—"The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." Chap. i. 21. He does not for a moment admit that either Ahraman or the devil had any kind of concern in his afflictions. He no more admits their influence in taking away his property and children, than in the bestowment of them. The giving and taking them away, are alike ascribed to Jehovah. Similar were his views and feelings, when afflicted with sore boils. His wife desired him to curse God and die. But he

says to her—"Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What! shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Job ii. 9, 10. Does this look like acknowledging the Persian evil god or the Christian's devil? Notwithstanding the popular opinions, that Ahraman was the cause of all evil, the severe bodily pain he suffered, and the taunts of his wife, he holds fast his integrity in the true God. Now, permit me to ask, if Job had believed, that either Ahraman or the devil brought his afflictions upon him, why did he ascribe them all to the true God, without reservation? And why did he not correct his wife's mistake, by telling her that Ahraman or the devil ought to be cursed? But Job had no faith in either, and hence he told her that she spoke as one of the *foolish* or *heathen* women speaketh. Job allowed of but one God, and it is evident, that his adversity and prosperity are both alike ascribed to him. See chap. xlii. 10—12, and i. 21.

2d. The speech of Job's wife, and his reply to her, show, that neither Ahraman nor the devil was the cause of his afflictions. She no doubt heard what he said, ch. i. 21. Upon seeing him still persisting in his integrity, under his affliction of the boils, she was provoked at him, and in taunting language says to him: "dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God and die." On the word rendered *to curse*, Parkhurst thus writes: "The lexicons have absurdly, and contrary to the authority of the ancient versions, given to this verb the sense of cursing in the six following passages: 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13; Job i. 5, 11, and ii. 5, 9. As to the two first, the Seventy render *Berek*, in both, by *eulogeo*. and so the Vulg. by *benedico*, *to bless*. And though Jezebel was herself an abominable idolatress,

yet, as the law of Moses still continued in force, she seems to have been wicked enough to have destroyed Naboth upon the false accusation of *blessing the heathen aleim* and Moloch, which subjected him to death, by Deut. xiii. 6—12. and xvii. 2—7. Job's fear, ch. i. 5, was lest his sons should have *blessed the false aleim;* and verse 11, he says, ought to be rendered—'And indeed stretch forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, surely he hath blessed thee to thy face,' *i. e.* hypocritically; the verb being used in the past tense. The Seventy render it, *truly he will bless thee to thy face.* And the Vulgate—*unless he hath blessed thee to thy face.* Comp. verses 5, 7. And 1 Kings xx. 23. Satan brings the same charge of hypocrisy against Job, chap. ii. 5, which the Seventy, Theodotian, and Vulgate render in the same manner. And at verse 9, his wife says to him, "*dost thou yet retain thy integrity,* thy regard for the true God, *blessing the aleim and dying,* or even to death?" Thus far Parkhurst, whose remarks shed additional light on this account. They agree with the usage of the word, which is rendered *to bless,* in other texts; they also accord with the charge of hypocrisy, which is brought against Job by his friends, throughout the book. But what deserves particular notice, these remarks show, that Job lived among a people who had a false *aleim* or god, and a contrast, if not a contest between this god and Jehovah is set forth in the account. The false god is spoken of as *one,* and not many; and what god could this be but Ahraman? For the Persians had only two, their good god and their evil god. That a contrast is set forth betwixt the false god and the true, is evident from Job's fear, chap. i. 5, lest his children should have *blessed* the false *aleim,* or god, instead of *cursing* the true God, as in the com-

mon version. It is also plain from the speech of his wife, who, instead of desiring Job to curse the true God, expresses her surprise, that he should continue to bless him, though at the point of death in suffering from his hands. It is apparent, that she believed in Ahraman, and entertained the opinions concerning him as stated above, by Prideaux. She was displeased with her husband, for continuing to trust in the true God, at the gates of death, and even blessing him for his afflictions. In desiring him to renounce his confidence in the true God, did she mean that he should become an atheist, or live without any God? No; she wished him to trust in Ahraman, the author of all evil, and the cause of all his afflictions. Job had despised him, and continued to trust in the true God to the last. She therefore wished him to abandon this confidence, and trust in the evil god, the true author of his afflictions. By doing so, he would become his friend, remove his afflictions, or terminate them by death.

3d. That this account of satan, is introduced to be condemned, appears from the reasonings of Job and his friends throughout the whole book. Job's friends, like himself, did not believe in Ahraman, for they maintain, that Jehovah, on account of his hypocrisy and wickedness, had sent such afflictions upon him. But I ask, does any one of them ever intimate that satan, whether Persian god or Christian devil, had produced his afflictions? No; they are to a man agreed, that they were the doings of Jehovah, nor do they insinuate, that he used satan as a tool in producing them. As a specimen of their sentiments on this subject, let the reader consult chap. iv. 9, and v. 17, 18, and viii. 3, 4. Job defends himself against the charge of hypocrisy and wickedness brought by his friends. See as

examples, chap. vi. 4, 5, vii. 20, 21, ix. 16—18, x. 2, xvi. 11—15, and xix. 21.

We may then appeal to every candid man, whether Job's friends would have been silent about satan producing his afflictions, if they believed so. And had they believed in satan, or Ahraman, the author of all evil, would they have ascribed his afflictions to Jehovah? Besides; had Job or his friends believed, that Jehovah used satan as an instrument in inflicting them, why is nothing said about it, either in their charge or his defence? In repelling their accusations, would Job have failed to urge that his afflictions arose from satan's great enmity against him, had he but suspected that this was true. All know, that people are not very scrupulous now in blaming the devil. Nothing could have been easier, or more natural, than for Job to repel the charges against him by saying, that satan hated him, and had thus afflicted him. Can any man then believe, that this account was introduced to establish the existence of such an evil being, yet this be contradicted by Job and his friends throughout the book? If true, why not rather go on to confirm such a doctrine. Is it objected—"if false why introduce it all?" I answer; for the purpose of refuting such an opinion, and for establishing the unity and supremacy of the true God. It is well known, that false gods are often introduced in Scripture, in contrast with the true, for the very purpose of exposing their absurdity. But I ask, is any false god ever allowed to be able to do good or evil? No; they are challenged to do either, to prove that they are gods. It is admitted by every intelligent man, that in the after parts of the Old Testament, and in the New, there are allusions to the evil principle deified, or the evil god of the Persians. And to darkness as the symbol of this god. See a specimen of these, and how the sacred

writers expose such a doctrine, Isai. xlv. 5—7, 2 Cor. vi. 15, x. 3 and xi. 13, 14, Eph. vi. 10.

4th. Job's afflictions are referred to, James v. 11, and his patience under them, is set forth as an example to us, but are not ascribed to satan but to Jehovah. Indeed, no sacred writers, these two chapters excepted, say or insinuate, that Ahraman or satan had any influence in producing them. But I have a right to demand, why no sacred writer has done this, if they believed as most people do now that satan was the author of Job's afflictions? If they had the same view of those two chapters as most people now have, is it possible that they would have been silent on such a subject?

5th. However prone the Jews were to idolatry, and the superstitions of the nations around them, it was a truth obviously taught in the Scriptures, that their God was good, and that he had no evil being as a rival to him. So far from giving any countenance to an evil being called Ahraman, Satan, Devil, or by any other name, all witchcraft, necromancy, or appeals to any other being or power stand condemned, and the Jews were solemnly charged to have no concern with them. Jehovah, and he alone, is declared to be the creator, preserver, and ruler of all things, and all beings in the universe. Life and death, sickness and health, prosperity and adversity, are all ascribed to him. See Gen. i. 1; Dan. iv. 35; 1 Sam. ii. 6, 7; Isa. xlv. 7; Amos iii. 6; Micah i. 12; Ps. xxxiii. 13—15; Prov. xvi. 4, 9 and xxi. 30. The idea of an evil being, which Christians call the devil and satan, and other nations by a variety of names, found no place in the Jewish Scriptures. That the Jews learnt such opinions from the heathen, we shall see in the next Section. In concluding our remarks on this account of satan in the book of Job, let us com-

pare what is said in it, with the above quotation from Prideaux, and we shall see all that has been advanced strongly confirmed.

Let us begin with the term satan. We have seen that this word signifies *an adversary.* That person or thing, is called a *satan* to another, which stands in his way, or in any shape opposes him. Thus, the angel of Jehovah, was a satan to Baalam, and the writing sent to Ahasuerus, was a satan to the Jews. Satan, in this account, is represented as opposed both to God and Job. He was their adversary or satan. Prideaux, in the above quotation, informs us, that Ahraman the evil god, was opposed to the good God, and that this opposition would continue to the end of the world. He also informs us that the evil god was considered the author and director of all evil. This is precisely the representation here given of satan. All Job's afflictions are supposed to be the doings of satan. Orthodox people contend that this was the case, and that satan is their devil. They have then got a heathen god, or the principle of evil deified, a mere nonentity for a devil. But is this very honorable to Christianity? And is it like persons, who reverence the word of God, flatly to contradict Job, in ascribing afflictions to satan which he ascribes to Jehovah? Job contends, that the good God was the author of his afflictions, as well as his prosperity. Those who believed in the evil god, did not deny, but the good God was the author of his prosperity, but would not admit him to be the author of his adversity. Job maintained that Jehovah was the author of both, blessing his name when he took away, as well as when he gave. By this the excellency of his character was made manifest.

But again; in the above quotation from Prideaux, it is not alleged, that the good and evil gods always

produced good and evil by their own immediate agency, but that these were brought about by the instrumentality of second causes. Though Job ascribes his prosperity and adversity to Jehovah, yet he and all the scripture writers represent him, as accomplishing both by means. Looking at the first two chapters of Job, the agents by which Job's afflictions were produced, are distinctly mentioned. For example, the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters carried away his flocks.—Were not they then a satan to Job, in the common scripture usage of this term? And does not their very manner of life, exactly agree to what satan says, chap. i. 7? "And the Lord said unto satan, whence comest thou?" Well, what answer does he make? He says, "from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." Just such an answer as those freebooters would have given, for it was their mode of life to roam about committing such depredations. Yea, *satan* is the very name given to such persons in the East to this day. Messrs. Fisk and King, two of the Palestine missionaries, thus write: "For two hours, however, as we moved along our attendants were engaged in loud and violent disputes with these and other companies of Bedouins, who came up after they went away. They extorted a few dollars from the Armenians and Greeks, and at last took an ass from one of the Arabs. Our Shekh knew all these freebooters, and it is probably owing to his acquaintance with them, and his faithfulness to us, that they were so easily satisfied, and that we met with so little trouble from them. He says, most of the Bedouins are much worse than these, and yet he called these satans (shaitan)." See Christian Spectator, vol. vii. p. 222. Such is the account given us by two orthodox missionaries. If the writer of the book of Job, did not include the Sabean and

Chaldean freebooters in the term satan, all will allow, that the ancient and present usage of this word in the East fully warranted him. We see then, that there was no need for the assistance of a fallen angel, to produce this part of Job's afflictions. The agent by which he lost his children, is as distinctly mentioned. We are told, chap. i. 18, 19. "That a great wind from the wilderness, smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon them and killed them." Such was the cause, which produced this effect, nor do we perceive, that the aid of any evil being was required to accomplish it. We may just as well accuse satan of blowing down every house which is destroyed by a tornado. Job's sheep were killed by lightning, and it and the wind are agents in the natural world by which God accomplishes his pleasure, over which Ahraman or the Christian's devil have no control.

Again; looking at this account, and comparing it with the quotation from Prideaux, we see why Job's boils are expressly ascribed to satan, without any other agent being concerned in their production. All evil indiscriminately, was ascribed to the evil god or satan, as all good was to the good god. But, as there was no visible agent to which the boils could be ascribed, no agent in this case is mentioned. Satan, or the evil god, has to father this affliction himself, without the assistance of any agent. Hence it is said, satan smote Job with the boils, which is not said respecting his other afflictions, though the whole aspect of the account, is in agreement with considering him the author and director of all evil. I shall only add, that it has always appeared strange, that in this account, satan should be represented as conversing freely and familiarly with God. But if the account be as I have stated, the good and evil gods are here only represented as conversing

together. It was in unison with the popular opinions concerning them.

In concluding our remarks, let us briefly notice some points of similarity in the Magian creed, to those of Christian creeds in the present day.

The Persians then had *one* good being or god, and also *one* evil being. Or, as Prideaux observes, "that is to say God and the devil." Christians in this are perfectly agreed with them, for they believe in *one* God, and also *one* devil. Again; the Persians believed, that these two gods were the authors of all good and evil in the world. In this also Christians agree with them, for all good they ascribe to God, and impute all evil to satan or the devil. Further; the Persians made darkness the symbol of their evil god. So do Christians. When they speak of the devil he is described as black, dark, and hideous, and as loving darkness, dwelling in darkness, and keeping men in darkness, and will lead them at last into eternal darkness. Again; the Persians believed that their good god was eternal. Some believed also, that their evil god was eternal.—About this, there was a difference of opinion. So all Christians believe their God to be eternal, but about the devil there is a difference of opinion. Though none of them believe him to have been from all eternity, yet some of them believe that he is to live forever, and shall remain eternally the same wicked being. Others of them think, that after a long period of punishment, he will be either struck out of existence, or be redeemed and made eternally happy. But again, the Persians believed, that there was a continual opposition between their good god and evil god, and that this should continue to the end of the world. Then, the good god shall overcome the evil god, and thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself,

that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil god his world with all evil men with him. Christians contend, that there is a continual opposition between their God and the devil, and that this opposition shall continue to the end of the world. Then, God is to overcome the devil, and from that time henceforward, God is to have his world and all good men with him, and the devil is to have his world, and all wicked men with him. Such are a few of the leading points of similarity, between the ancient Magian faith and the faith of Christians in our day, respecting God, the devil, and future punishment. It is but proper and fair to notice

2d. Some of the points of dissimilarity between them. The Magians believed, that their good and evil gods were only "two principles." These principles they not only personified, but deified and worshipped. When Xerxes prayed for evil on his enemies, "he addressed his prayer to Arimanius the evil god, and not to Ormasdes, their good god." Christians believe their God and the devil to be, not two principles, but two beings. Their devil is not only a being, but was once an angelic being, but for his sin and rebellion was cast out of heaven. Christians do not worship their devil. But alas, too many who profess to be Christians, like Xerxes, when they wish evil on their enemies, pray to the devil. Christians have a great number of names for their devil. But it is apparent, that whether such a being is called Ahraman, Arimanius, satan, or devil, the leading features of his character among all nations are the same. The evil god has become the Christian's devil. In fact, they make their devil the worst being, for though it was believed that their evil god, should at the end of the world have a world to himself with all wicked men, yet it does not appear, that they believed he was to be

their eternal tormentor. But it is well known, that this is a principal article in most orthodox creeds, and no man would be deemed orthodox, who denied it. I shall only add, that though the Persians and Christians agree in hating Ahraman or the devil, yet the latter have not carried their hatred so far as to write the devil's name inverted. In the next Section we shall see, that the Magian creed was much improved by Zoroaster, and that Christians have not only adopted his sentiments, but the very language in which he expressed them.

Psalm xxxviii. 20, comes next to be considered.—"They also that render evil for good are mine *adversaries*." Here the word *satan* occurs in the plural, and is rendered as usual *adversaries*. It is useless to make any remarks on this text, for its context clearly shows, that David is not speaking of fallen angels but of men. In verse 19 he calls them his *enemies*, and speaks of them as lively, strong, and multiplied.

Psalm lxxi. 13. "Let them be confounded and consumed, that are adversaries to my soul." The word *satan* is also used here in the plural, and is again rendered *adversaries*. In verse 10, David calls these satans or adversaries his enemies, and the whole Psalm shows, that he is not speaking of wicked spirits but of wicked men.

Psalm cix. 4. "For my love they are my *adversaries*." Here again the word *satan* occurs in the plural form, and is rendered *adversaries*. It is generally contended, that this psalm relates to Christ and his adversaries, or satans. It is certain, that verse 8 is quoted Acts i. and is applied to Judas. This term occurs in several other parts of the psalm which we shall briefly notice. In verse 6 it is said, "set thou a wicked man over him: and let satan stand at his right hand."—Here, the word *satan* is left untranslated, but is render-

ed *adversary* in the margin. In the Jewish mode of parallelism, a wicked man in the first part of the verse, is the same as satan in the second. For an illustration of what is said about satan, or a wicked man *standing at his right hand when he shall be judged* in verse 7, see on Zach. iii. 1, 2, below. In verse 20, it is said—"let this be the reward of mine *adversaries* from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul."—The word *satan* is here again used in the plural, and rendered *adversaries*. It is rendered in the same way, verse 29. "Let mine *adversaries* be clothed with shame, and let them cover themselves with their own confusion, as with a mantle." On the whole of this psalm, and the use of the term satan in it, we would merely remark, that no person who reads it, can suppose that there is the least reference to a fallen angel. It is evident, if the psalm refers to the Messiah, Judas and the persecuting Jews are designated by the term satan; and shows us the propriety of the terms devil and satan being applied to them in the New Testament, as we shall afterwards see.

Zach. iii. 1, 2, is the last place where the term satan occurs in the Old Testament. "And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and satan standing at his right hand to resist him And the Lord said unto satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O satan: even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee; is not this a brand plucked out of the fire." Here the word satan is again left untranslated, except in verse 1, where it is rendered "*to resist him.*" In the margin, it is, to "*be his adversary.*" In the Seventy's version, the word satan is throughout this passage rendered *diabolos*. On the whole of it I remark,

1st. Let the word *satan* be only rendered adversa-

ry throughout these verses, and the idea of a fallen angel vanishes. The reader can easily put this remark to the trial, by substituting the term adversary for satan, in reading the passage. From our habit of associating the idea of a fallen angel with the term satan, and not with the word adversary, this and some other texts are supposed to teach such a doctrine. But can this false association establish it?

2d. If it were necessary, it could be shown, what satan or adversary was meant. Let any one read Ezra, chaps. iii. and iv., and note particularly what is said concerning Tatnai, and Shethar-boznai, in chap. v, and little doubt can remain, that they were the satan or adversary referred to. It is allowed, that Zachariah prophesied about the time the events in the book of Ezra took place. Compare with this, what is said on Ezra iv. 6, above. If people will interpret this passage literally of a fallen angel, why not also interpret the following chapters, in the same book, literally. See chaps. i., ii., v., vi.

3d. In this passage and in Psal. cix. 6, above, Jahn thinks there is an allusion to the forms of judicial trials in ancient times. He thus writes: "The ceremonies which were observed in conducting a judicial trial, were as follows;—1. The accuser and the accused both made their appearance before the judge or judges, Deut. xxv. 1, who sat with legs crossed upon the floor, which was furnished for their accommodation, with carpet and cushions. A secretary was present, at least in more modern times, who wrote down the sentence, and indeed every thing in relation to the trial; for instance, the articles of agreement, that might be entered into, previous to the commencement of the judicial proceedings, Isa. x. 1, 2. Jer. xxxii. 1—14. The Jews assert that there were *two* secretaries, the

one being seated to the right of the judge, who wrote the sentence of not guilty, the other to the left, who wrote the sentence of condemnation. Comp. Matth. xxv. 33—46. That an apparitor or beadle was present, is apparent from other sources. 2. The accuser was denominated, in Hebrew, SATAN, or *the adversary*, Zach. iii. 1—3. Psalm cix. 6. The judge or judges were seated, but both of the parties implicated stood up, the accuser standing to the right hand of the accused. The latter, at least, after the captivity, when the cause was one of great consequence, appeared, with hair dishevelled, and in a garment of mourning."

Such are all the texts in the Old Testament, where the term *satan* occurs. The reader can now judge for himself, if it is ever used by the writers as the *name* of a fallen angel, who ruined our first parents and all their posterity.

SECTION IV.

THE OPINION, THAT THE DEVIL OR SATAN IS A REAL BEING, WITH OTHER CONNECTED OPINIONS, SHOWN TO HAVE THEIR ORIGIN IN HEATHENISM.

IT has been shown in the two preceding Sections, that the Old Testament gives no countenance to the common doctrine of a fallen angel, under the name serpent, satan, or any other. Indeed, we think it has been established, that the account of satan in the first two chapters of Job, was introduced for the express

purpose of refuting such opinions. A very important inquiry arises, How came such opinions to be imbibed by Christians, become so current in the world, and even seem to derive countenance from the New Testament? To account for these and other things shall be our business in the present Section.

1st. In the early stages of the Jewish history, we read of witches and witchcraft. Injunctions are given against these, before we hear any thing about satan or the devil. But nothing is said to them about witchcraft, until they were about to enter Canaan. Many of the injunctions delivered to the Jewish nation, were for the purpose of fortifying them against such heathen notions, and preserving them in the fear and service of the one living and true God. See, concerning this, Levit. xix. 26, 31; xx. 6, 27; Deut. xviii. 9—12; Exod. xxii. 18. Comp. Isai. xlvii. 12, 13; 1 Sam. chap. xxviii. The inhabitants of Canaan were given to idolatry and witchcraft, with similar superstitions. But such a being as Christians call the *devil*, was neither worshipped nor known among them. They had abundance of idols, but no *devil* or *satan*, nor are the Jews cautioned to beware of imbibing such an opinion. It is then a very great mistake, which many good people have made, in calling witchcraft the devil's art, and in thinking witches and wizzards were in league with him. Concerning this, Michaelis, on the laws of Moses, thus writes, vol. iv. page 89: "We must, however, entertain very different sentiments on this point, in reference to the time of Moses. For in the Biblical writings prior to the Babylonish captivity, we meet with very little notice of the devil, and it would seem that the effects which he could produce on the material world, were considered as but very trifling. The wizzards of those days rather ascribed

the efficacy of their conjurations to other gods; and therefore, in the Israelitish polity, witchcraft was commonly accounted a species of idolatry, and, of course, most severely punishable. Hence orthodox theology, in the time of Moses, could look upon it in no other light, than as an imposture: for no one could maintain, that it operated preternaturally, without admitting the existence of other gods, and their power over the material world." The Jews before they entered Canaan knew nothing about the devil. Nor did its idolatrous inhabitants, for he was not known in that part of the world. If then, as now, he walked about seeking whom he might devour, it is very unaccountable he should not be familiarly known in Canaan, a land full of idols, and witches, and all manner of wickedness. It seems all these could exist in those days without any devil to produce them. Nor is Moses, or rather God, under any apprehension, that he would visit that country. We shall see that the Jews were obliged to go to a foreign land to find the devil.

2d. The Jews were carried to Babylon, and spent seventy years in captivity. Here, the Magian religion, revived and improved by Zoroaster, prevailed; and here we shall find that they became acquainted with the doctrine of the devil, and with other religious opinions not found in their scriptures. To this point I shall now turn the attention of the reader. Prideaux, vol. i. pp. 219—240, gives us an account of Zoroaster, his religion, and its success; a few brief extracts from which I shall only make. He says—"In the time of his (Darius Hystaspes) reign first appeared in Persia the famous prophet of the Magians, whom the Persians call Zerdusht, or Zaratush, and the Greeks, Zoroaster, He was the greatest impostor, except Mahomet, that ever appeared in the world, and

had all the craft and enterprising boldness of that Arab, but much more knowledge; for he was excellently skilled in all the learning of the East that was in his time; whereas the other could neither read nor write; and particularly he was thoroughly versed in the Jewish religion, and in all the sacred writings of the Old Testament that were then extant, which makes it most likely, that he was, as to his origin, a Jew. And it is generally said of him, that he had been a servant to one of the prophets of Israel, and that it was by this means that he came to be so well skilled in the Holy Scriptures, and all other Jewish knowledge; which is a further proof that he was of that people; it not being likely that a prophet of Israel should entertain him as a servant, or instruct him as a disciple, if he were not of the same seed of Israel, as well as of the same religion with him; and that especially since it was the usage of that people, by principle of religion, as well as by long received custom among them, to separate themselves from all other nations, as far as they were able. And it is farther to be taken notice of, that most of those who speak of his original, say, that he was of Palestine, within which country the land of Judea was. And all this put together, amounts with me to a convincing proof that he was first a Jew, and that by birth, as well as religion, before he took upon him to be prophet of the Magian sect.

"He did not found a new religion, as his successor in imposture, Mahomet did, but only took upon him to revive and reform an old one, that of the Magians, which had been for many ages past the national religion of the Medes, as well as of the Persians: for it having fallen into disgrace on the death of those ring-leaders of that sect, who had usurped the sovereignty

after the death of Cambyses, and the slaughter which was then made of all the chief men among them, it sunk so low, that it became almost extinct, and Sabianism every where prevailed against it, Darius and most of his followers on that occasion going over to it. But the affection which the people had for the religion of their forefathers, and which they had been all brought up in, not being easily to be rooted out, Zoroaster saw that the revival of this was the best game of imposture that he could then play; and, having so good an old stock to graft upon, he did with the greater ease make all his new scions to grow which he inserted into it.

"The chief reformation which he made in the Magian religion was in the first principle of it: for whereas before they had held the being of two first causes, the first light, or the good god, who was the author of all good; and the other darkness, or the evil god, who was the author of all evil; and that of the mixture of these two, as they were in a continual struggle with each other, all things were made; he introduced a principle superior to them both, one supreme God, who created both light and darkness, and out of these two, according to the alone pleasure of his own will made all things else that are, according to what is said in the xlv. chapter of Isaiah, 5, 6, 7. "I am the Lord, and there is none else: there is no God besides me; I girded thee, though thou hast not known me, that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil, I the Lord do all these things." For these words being directed to Cyrus, king of Persia, must be understood as spoken in reference to the Persian sect of the Magians, who then held light and darkness, or good and evil, to be the su-

preme beings, without acknowledging the great god who is superior to both. And I doubt not it was from hence that Zoroaster had the hint of mending this great absurdity in their theology. But to avoid making God the author of evil, his doctrine was, that God originally and directly created only light or good, and that darkness or evil followed it by consequence, as the shadow doth the person; that light or good had only a real production from God, and the other afterwards resulted from it, as the defect thereof. In sum, his doctrine as to this particular was, that there was one Supreme Being independent and self-existing from all eternity. That under him there were two angels, one the angel of light, who is the author and director of all good; and the other the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil; and that these two, out of the mixture of light and darkness, made all things that are; that they are in a perpetual struggle with each other; and that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil; that this struggle shall continue to the end of the world; that then there shall be a general resurrection, and a day of judgment, wherein just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works; after which the angel of darkness, and his disciples, shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishments of their evil deeds; and the angel of light, and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated forever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity. And all this the remainder of that sect, which is now in Persia and India,

do, without any variation, after so many ages, still hold even to this day."

On these extracts, and other things stated in the pages referred to, I shall make a few general remarks. Zoroaster being a Jew, well acquainted with the Jewish scriptures, and skilled in all the learning of the East, was pre-eminently qualified for the game of imposture which he played. He did not invent a new religion, but only revived and improved the ancient Magian religion. As Prideaux says—"He grafted all his new scions on this old stock and they grew." The Magian religion "had been for many ages past the ancient national religion of the Medes as well as of the Persians." Zoroaster's improved system soon became popular, national, and generally universal in the East. Though at first, it met with great opposition from the Sabians, yet he soon drew over to it Darius, whose example was soon followed by the "courtiers, nobility, and all the great men of the kingdom." The time in which he flourished, "was while Darius Hystaspes was king of Persia." The sect flourished from his time, which, to "the death of Yazdejard, the last Persian king of the Magian religion, was about eleven hundred years. But after the Mahometans had overrun Persia, in the seventh century after Christ, the Archimagus was forced to remove from thence into Kerman, which is a province in Persia, lying upon the Southern Ocean, towards India, and there it hath continued even to this day."—But for these and other important statements I must generally refer to Prideaux's account. Malte Brun says this sect exists in Africa, and that in Congo, "the good principle is named Zamba M'Poonga; and the evil principle which is opposed to him, Caddee M'Peemba." Geog. B. 68 pp. 274, 328. Impostor as Zoroaster was, he did not choose to make "God the

author of evil." To avoid this *absurdity* he held "that God originally and directly created only light or good, and that darkness or evil followed it by consequence, as the shadow doth the person: that light or good had only a real production from God, and the other afterwards resulted from it as the defect thereof." But, we shall notice some of the articles of Zoroaster's creed, more immediately connected with our present subject, and compare them with the articles found in Christian creeds of the present day.

1st. Zoroaster taught, that under the supreme God "there were two angels, one the angel of light, who is the author and director of all good, and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil." It is very evident that his "angel of darkness," answers to the devil of Christians, for they believe their devil to be the author and director of all evil. They believe he was its author at first in deceiving Eve, and has been its author and director ever since. Both moral and physical evil are ascribed to him. The resemblance between them, is not only evident as it respects the powers and qualities both are said to possess, but the very name given to them. It is well known, Christians call their devil "the angel of darkness." Between Zoroaster's "angel of darkness," and the devil of Christians, I can perceive little or no difference. The Magians first deified the principle of evil, then Zoroaster changed this god into an angel of darkness, and Christians have adopted him for their devil; and lest his origin should be lost in the lapse of ages, have called him by the same name. But the resemblance is further manifest, by considering, that the angel of light and the angel of darkness "are in a perpetual struggle with each other; and that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is

good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil; and that this struggle shall continue to the end of the world." I ask all candid Christians, if this is not what they believe concerning their devil? Is it not their faith and their phraseology, that God and the devil are in a perpetual struggle? That this struggle shall continue between them unto the end of the world, and that God finally shall overcome the devil? Who can deny all this? And what Christian man can have the face to deny that Christians have made a devil out of Zoroaster's angel of darkness, for it was impossible he could make his angel of darkness out of their devil. It is also apparent, Christians believe, as Zoroaster has taught them, "that where the angel of light or the good God prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness, or their devil prevails, there the most is evil." Prideaux considers it a great absurdity in the ancient Magian religion, that "light and darkness, or good and evil, were the supreme beings, without acknowledging the great good God, who is superior to both." But is the absurdity much less among Christians, in holding to one supreme God, and a devil, whom they make but little inferior to him? It is true, they have not two gods in name, for they do not believe in the devil as a god. But what signifies a mere name, when in fact they ascribe to him all the characteristics of a God; yea, the very same as the ancient Magians ascribed to their evil god, and Zoroaster to his angel of darkness. Their devil struggles with the true God, and is in a continual struggle with him, and is not to give it up until the end of the world. In all past ages, they say that their devil has had the ascendancy in this struggle, for evil hitherto has most prevailed. See Mr. Emerson's treatise on the Milennium.

I would suggest it for consideration, whether Zoroaster's "angel of light," is not a corruption of the Scripture doctrine concerning the Messiah. He is called the angel of the Lord, and the angel of the covenant. Between him and the seed of the serpent there is a continual struggle, and this struggle is to continue to the end of the world, when all things shall be subdued to him. But, though he was manifested to destroy the works of the devil; yea, through death to destroy the devil, this devil was not a "fallen angel," or "an angel of darkness," or "an evil god," as we shall see, Section vi. Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 14, seems to allude to this tenet of Zoroaster's creed, in saying, satan is transformed into "*an angel of light.*" It is implied, that before this transformation he was "*an angel of darkness*," which are the very expressions used by Zoroaster. See, on this text, Section v.

2d. Let us now consider, what Zoroaster says shall take place at the end of the world, and compare it with the creeds of most Christians. He says—"then there shall be a general resurrection." This article Zoroaster no doubt learned from his acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures, for the resurrection from the dead, was the ultimate hope of believers in Christ, who was promised to the fathers. At this resurrection, he says there shall be "a day of judgment." This, Zoroaster could not learn from the Old Testament, for it does not teach such a doctrine, and when he made his creed, the New was not in existence. The phrase "*day of judgment*," used by him, is that now used by Christians, and in the same sense as he used it. In my answer to Mr. Sabine, I examined every text in which this phrase is found, and showed, that it is not once used in the Bible, in the sense which Zoroaster and Christians have attached to it. To it I beg leave to refer the reader,

who inclines to examine this subject. Christians must have borrowed the sense they attach to the phrase "day of judgment" from his creed, for he could not borrow it from theirs, as the chronology of the cases show. But let us hear Zoroaster, about what shall take place at the day of judgment? He says—"just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works." It cannot be denied, that this is the very sentiment and language of Christian creeds. But I ask, how Zoroaster could learn either this sentiment or its phraseology from the Old Testament? If he did, intelligent and learned orthodox men have erred greatly, in admitting this doctrine is not taught in the Old Testament. Jahn, in his Archaelogy, thus writes, p. 398. "We have not authority, therefore, decidedly to say, that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and avoid the evil, than those which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life. That *these* were the motives which were presented to their minds in order to influence them to pursue a right course of conduct, is expressly asserted, Isai. xxvi. 9, 10, and may be learnt also from the imprecations, which are met with, in many parts of the Old Testament.—The *Mehestani*, who were disciples of Zoroaster, believed in the immortality of the soul, in rewards and punishments, after death, and in the resurrection of the body; at the time of which resurrection, all the bad would be purged by fire, and associated with the good. Zend. Avesta, P. I. pp. 107, 108; P. II. pp. 211, 227, 229; 124, 125; 173, 245, 246; Comp. Ezek. xxxvii. 1—14."

According to this writer, "the ancient Hebrews" were not taught the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. But he honestly tells us that the "disciples of Zoroaster believed in the immortality of the soul, in

rewards and punishments after death." It is true, the Andover translator of Jahn's work, in the paragraph preceding, inserts the following words in correction of his author. ["And although he (Solomon) no where in express terms holds up the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, informs us in chap. xii. 14, of something very much like it, viz. '*That God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or evil.*'"] Such is the proof adduced in opposition to Jahn, of future rewards and punishments. Our readers can judge for themselves as to its conclusiveness. It leaves one serious difficulty unrelieved. How came Zoroaster and his disciples to speak so explicitly about this doctrine, if it was not clearly revealed in the Old Testament? No Christian can speak of it with more plainness than they did, if Prideaux and Jahn in the above quotations speak truth concerning them. Christians now, use their very language, in expressing their ideas on the subject. With pleasure we acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Upham, for his translation of Jahn's valuable work, and this obligation would have been much increased, had he referred us to the parts of the Old Testament from which Zoroaster could so clearly learn his doctrine concerning the immortality of the soul and future punishment. Or, if he could not, account for this impostor's knowing so much more about it than the inspired writers. According to Jahn's account, Zoroaster disciples did not believe in endless punishment. At "the resurrection, all the bad would be purged by fire, and associated with the good" was their belief, and this accords with the opinions of some Christians in the present day.

But, let us hear Zoroaster, about what is to succeed this day of judgment and retribution. He says—

"After which the angel of darkness, and his disciples, shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds; and the angel of light and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated forever; and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity." We have seen that Zoroaster's "angel of darkness," and "the devil" of Christians, are the same both as to qualities and name.—Here the sameness is still more manifest, for what honest man can deny, that Christians have adopted his very sentiments and language. For example, Zoroaster's "angel of darkness" had disciples. Well, Christians say their devil has disciples. His angel of darkness with his disciples, after the day of judgment shall go into a world of their own. So say Christians concerning their devil and his disciples. His angel of darkness with his disciples, in this world of their own, "shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds." And do not Christians say the very same of their devil and his disciples? Every orthodox man must believe that the devil with his disciples, or all wicked men, are to suffer in a world of their own "in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds," and that "the angel of light, and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds: and that after this they shall remain separated forever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity." What man would be deemed orthodox, who refused to believe these things? And why not allow, that Zoroaster, the greatest impostor that ever arose, Mahomet excepted, was in these

things as orthodox as they are. In these things he was orthodox long before them. There is only one of the above articles about which they differ from him in opinion. To the honor of our orthodox brethren be it spoken, they do not say, that the disciples of the angel of light receive future blessedness as a reward for good deeds done by them here. No, they say, it is not of works but of grace, lest any man should boast. It is true, the grace whereby they save men, is rather a purchased grace, than free grace, but on this I forbear remarking.

But it is added by Prideaux—"and all this the remainder of that sect which is now in Persia and India, do without any variation, after so many ages, still hold even to this day." If they hold all the above articles, "without any variation to this day," and if they are all true, as Dean Prideaux asserts, why be at so much trouble and expense to send them missionaries? The chief articles in modern Christian creeds were propagated there many ages before the Christian religion existed.

It deserves the serious consideration of the whole orthodox body, whether missionaries ought not to come from Persia and India here, to correct the innovations and additions made in the creed of the great Zoroaster. But I must leave this, and other reflections arising from the above statements to be made by the reader.

We have now noticed some of the principal articles of Zoroaster's creed, and would ask Christians—Brethren, from what divine source did this arch impostor learn all these articles of his creed?—1st. Was it from the Old Testament scripture? This you will not affirm, for intelligent orthodox men allow it does not contain such articles. If it does contain them,

you can find them there as well as Zoroaster, and we call on you to prove them from this book. 2d. Did Zoroaster learn such articles from the New Testament? This was impossible, for it was not in existence for more than six hundred years after the days of Zoroaster. 3d. Did Zoroaster learn them from God, when he pretended God spoke to him out of the midst of the fire? This cannot be affirmed unless you admit him to be a true prophet of the Lord. But he is declared the greatest impostor which ever arose, Mahomet excepted. 4th. Did Zoroaster invent these articles of his creed? No other alternative is left, but to admit this, or prove that he derived them from the Old Testament, or by special revelation from God. If he invented them, then he was the author of the principal articles in modern creeds. 5th. Do you say, your articles, so similar to his creed, were neither derived from him, nor from the old Testament, but entirely from the New? This will not do, for even allowing such articles to be clearly taught in the New Testament, it is evident Jesus Christ and his apostles had not the honor of first revealing them to the world. Zoroaster, the arch impostor, had published them all over the East, six hundred years before Christ appeared. If such articles are found in the New Testament, Jesus Christ and his apostles were indebted to this impostor for inventing them. Should you say, Jesus Christ and his apostles derived these articles from God by immediate revelation, permit me to ask you, who revealed them to Zoroaster six hundred years before the Christian era? Did God reveal them to him? If he did, why not allow him to have been a true prophet of the Lord? And why not frankly own, that Jesus Christ and his apostles did not first reveal such articles of faith, but that God first revealed them

through his great prophet Zoroaster? Perhaps you may say, such articles were communicated by inspiration to Christ and his apostles, and it is on their authority that you believe them. Beware, I beseech you, of taking this ground, for this is saying, Zoroaster, a notorious impostor, invented articles of faith, which, six hundred years after their invention, God sanctioned as divine revelation. Was God indebted to an impostor for suggesting to him a religious creed suited to the Christian dispensation? For the honor of God, of Christ, and his apostles, yea, for the honor of Christianity, we hope you will not assert this. If Zoroaster learnt such articles of his creed from a divine source, it must have been from the Old Testament. But few will be found who will assert that it contains them, for this ground is abandoned by orthodox intelligent men, and their defence is drawn from the New Testament. But if their defence can be made from the Old, we request the different articles be distinctly taken up and proved from it. Dan. xii. 2, is the most plausible text which can be adduced, from which he could learn the doctrine of endless punishment. This passage will be fully considered in the Second Part, to which I refer the reader. As to satan being a fallen angel, who deceived Eve, tormented Job, and has become the Christian's devil, we leave all to form their own opinion from the evidence which has been adduced.

Let it now be remembered, that while the Jews dwelt in Canaan they knew nothing about the devil. If they did, it was merely by report, that the Persians and other nations believed in such a being. They had precepts, guarding them against witchcraft, idolatry, and all the abominations of the Canaanites, but not one guarding them against that almost infinite

being whom Christians call the devil. How our orthodox brethren account for this, I am unable to say. On my views, it is easily and rationally accounted for. The devil was the principle of evil deified, transformed by Zoroaster into an angel of darkness, and the Jews must go to Babylon to get acquainted with him. That the Jews spent seventy years in captivity there, is a fact disputed by no one. The question which then comes forward for consideration is—*Did the Jews imbibe, during their captivity, and did they bring back from it any religious opinions which were not taught in their sacred books? Were any of those opinions derived from the creed of Zoroaster, and was that now entertained concerning the devil of this number?* To see how this matter stands, we solicit the reader's attention to the following particulars.

1st. The Magian religion for many ages had been the "national religion of the Medes as well as of the Persians," as stated by Prideaux. About the time the Jews were in captivity in Babylon, Zoroaster flourished there, in reviving and improving it. Jahn, p. 391, thus writes respecting the time when the Jews were carried there. "When at length admonitions ceased to be of any great avail, and every thing was growing worse and worse, the *Israelitish* commonwealth was overthrown, two hundred and fifty-three years after their separation from Judah, and seven hundred and twenty-two before Christ. The people were carried away by the Assyrians into Gozan, Chalacene, the cities of Media, and into Assyria. The kingdom of Judah was overthrown three hundred and eighty-seven years after the separation, five hundred and eighty-eight before Christ, by the Chaldeans, and the people were carried captive to the banks of the river Chebar, in Babylonia." Prideaux says, vol. i. p. 65,

that the Jews were carried to Babylon in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, which, according to his chronology, was six hundred and six years before Christ. It was not for want of a fair opportunity, if the Jews did not imbibe opinions not found in their scriptures.

2d. When they were carried to Babylon no particular place was appointed for them, but they appear to have been dispersed throughout the provinces of that vast empire. It was not with the Jews here, as with their forefather's in Egypt, a particular spot being assigned them, where they lived all together, and could fortify each other against a departure from the religion of Jehovah. Their dispersed condition rendered them liable to forget their own religion, and insensibly imbibe the opinions of those among whom they lived.

3d. The very religion of Zoroaster had many things about it calculated to lead Jews to embrace it. It recognized the first principle of their own, the supremacy of one God; was the religion of the king, his court, and of all the nobility. It was popular throughout the whole empire. These, and other things noticed by Prideaux, which I forbear particularizing, all concurred to make the religion of Zoroaster very fascinating to the Jews. For them to oppose it was only to render themselves as odious there, as I am likely to be among orthodox people here, in opposing their doctrine concerning the devil. Jahn, in his Archaeology, thus writes, pp. 393—4: "The similitude, which existed between the system of Moses, and that of Zoroaster, which prevailed in Persia and Media, may be summed up in a single article, viz., that they both discountenanced the worship of *idols*. For, 1. That original beginning of all things, called HAZARUAM, was neither the creator nor governor of the world, but the

endless succession of time, which was represented by Zoroaster, as the supreme existence, ENS, or fountain of being. From Hazaruam, proceeded Ormuz and Ahrimanes. Ormuz acted the part of creator of the world; a circumstance which caused no little envy in the mind of Ahrimanes, and induced him to mingle with the workmanship of Ormuz, the seeds or principles of evil, which exist. By the Mehestani, moreover, or followers of Zoroaster, not only Ormuz, but six AMSCHASPANDI, also innumerable spirits, dispersed every where, the sun, moon, stars, and other earthly existences, were worshipped without distinction. 2. If the example of the Medes and Persians, who worshipped Ormuz as the creator and governor of the world, confirmed the Hebrews in the worship of Jehovah, it was equally likely, on the other hand, to induce them to adore the stars, and spirits, which occupied so conspicuous a place in the system of those nations; also the horses and chariots of the sun, which the ancestors of King Josiah, influenced by the example of the Mehestani, had introduced at Jerusalem, and perhaps, to practise that species of Magian worship, witnessed by Ezekiel in the temple of Jerusalem."

4th. The Jews previous to the captivity, had been preparing themselves in the school of superstition and wickedness, for embracing such opinions at Babylon. Jahn says, p. 392. "During the period immediately preceding their overthrow, every kind of superstition, and every moral pollution prevailed in both kingdoms, especially in that of Judah. No other means therefore remained to correct their vices, but that of extreme severity, by which their whole nation, dispersed from their country into distant regions, and humbled and afflicted, might learn that they could do no-

thing without God, and that idols could lend them no assistance."

5th. The long duration of their captivity, unavoidably led to the adoption of such opinions in religion. It was known by the Jews, that their captivity was to be for seventy years, and were desired to make their temporal arrangements accordingly. See the prophets' injunctions about this. But let us suppose, what is hardly supposable, that all the persons who went to Babylon over twenty years of age, were proof against imbibing any false opinion. Suffer me to ask, how were all under that age, and all born there to be preserved? Without a constant miracle they could not, and no one affirms that a miracle was wrought to preserve them. It is then morally certain, that the Jews on their return, must bring back with them many of the religious opinions of the people among whom they had lived: unless we can prove, that they changed all their religious opinions, as easily as a man can shift his clothing.

6th. Prideaux shows from the Old Testament Scriptures, that some of the Jews had gone over to the Magian religion. He refers to Ezek. viii. 16, where the prophet, being carried in vision to Jerusalem, saw "about five and twenty men standing between the porch and the altar, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east; and they worshipped the sun. The meaning of which is, that they had turned their backs upon the true worship of God, and had gone over to that of the Magians." Here then is direct proof of the fact from Scripture, that Zoroaster's religion was not only imbibed, but the worship it enjoined practised by the Jews. But as very little of the Old Testament was written after the captivity, we observe,

7th. That learned men agree that the Jews brought back from their captivity religious opinions, not taught in their Scriptures. I shall only quote the following writers in proof. Michaelis, on the Laws of Moses, vol. ii. p. 348, thus writes: "In the New Testament, indeed, and in the Jewish language after the period of the Babylonish captivity, from which the Israelites returned much enriched in names for the devil, *Belial* means the devil. But in the Old Testament it never has this meaning." Again; L'Enfant, in his Introduction to the Reading of the Scriptures, p. 14, thus writes: "But this much is certain, that from that time (of Alexander the Great) the Jews began to *Helenize;* that the Greek tongue, spoken by the *Macedonians,* became more common among them, and that they also introduced some of the opinions of the Greek philosophers, as the transmigration of souls, for instance. We find some steps of this notion even in the New Testament, as in Luke xvi. 23, where there is an account of the abode of departed souls, conformable to the *Grecian philosophy,* and in John ix. 2, where we find an allusion to the *pre-existence* and *transmigration* of souls. It is, moreover, evident from the Apochryphal writings, from Philo, Josephus, and the Talmudists, that the Jews, especially the Pharisees, had learned and followed the Grecian philosophy ever since their conversing with the Greeks under *Alexander the Great,* the *Ptolemies,* and Seleucidæ, his successors, who reigned in Egypt and Syria." Those who wish to see more authority in proof of this point may consult Dr. Campbell's Sixth Dissertation, part i. sect. 19, quoted in my First Inquiry, chap. i. sect. 3. See also Jahn's Archae., pp. 235, 396. The Jews then had two sources from which they derived opinions in religion not taught in their Scriptures;

the opinions of Zoroaster, and those of the Greek philosophers.

8th. What conclusively proves that the Jews brought back from their captivity many opinions not learned from their sacred books, are the Apocryphal writings. The books called Apocrypha, though not canonical, are allowed to be the best writings extant, relative to the Jews after the captivity. To these I shall now call the attention of the reader, collecting from them, what were the religious opinions of the Jews in the times to which they relate. Let us consider

1st. What were their opinions respecting *evil beings or spirits?* We shall begin with their use of the term satan. It occurs only in Eccles. xxi. 27. It is doubtful what idea the writer attached to this word. The word *diabolos* occurs frequently in the original, but is rendered slanderer, accusation, &c. in the English version. See Eccles. xix. 15, xxvi. 5, xxviii. 9, xxxviii. 19, and li. 2, 1 Mac. i. 36, 2 Mac. xiv. 27. The only place where it is rendered *devil*, and which has a connexion with our present subject, is Wisdom of Solomon, ii. 24. "Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world; and they that do hold of his side do find it." The allusion here is to Genesis iii. and from this passage Christians have probably derived the idea that it was the devil that deceived Eve. If they can show a better source for this opinion, we hope it will be done. Paul says, death entered by sin, Rom. v. 12, and it was shown, Sec. ii, that no Old Testament writer intimates that death entered by the devil. Where then did the Apocryphal writers get this opinion? It must have been from the heathen, and it is evident this idea agrees to Zoroaster's angel of darkness, who was the author and director of all evil, death

not excepted. In the Apocrypha *evil spirits* are frequently mentioned. What child has not been amused with the account of "Asmodeus, the evil spirit" killing Sara's seven husbands? Also, of Raphael curing Tobit's eyes, and binding Asmodeus. And of the wonderful efficacy of the heart, liver and gall of a fish, which leaped out of the Tigris, the smoke of which smelled by the evil spirit, he fled into the utmost parts of Egypt, where the angel bound him. See Tobit, chaps. iii. vi. viii. xi. In Baruch iv. 7, 35, we read of devils, but the original word is not *diabolos* but *diamonion*. But as it is admitted on all hands, that *demons*, and the being Christians call the *devil*, are very different, it requires no attention from me in the present investigation. I would only remark in passing, that people's notions about satan, the devil, evil spirits, witches and wizzards, must be from a heathen source, for none of them are admitted to be real beings in the Old Testament. On the contrary they are there condemned as superstitions, and the Jews commanded to give no heed to them. Where then could the Jews learn such opinions but from their intercourse with the heathen? If the Jews imbibed the idea of witches in Canaan, and that of the devil and evil spirits at Babylon, and such beings are mentioned in the Apocrypha, are these sufficient reasons for our believing their existence? And is it possible that such beings can be recognized as real in the New Testament?

2d. What are the opinions taught in the Apocrypha about *Hell?* The Greek word *Hades*, rendered hell, occurs, Eccles. xxi. 10, and li. 5, 6. Song of the three children, verse 66. Tobit xiii. 2, 2 Esd. iv. 8, viii. 53, and ii. 29. It is the same word which is frequently rendered hell in the New Testament, and is synonymous with Sheol, also rendered hell in the Old. The

word Gehenna, also rendered hell in the New Testament, does not occur in any of the books of the Apocrypha. By *hell*, in all the above texts, is meant the same as Sheol, the grave, or state of the dead. The idea of a place of endless punishment, does not appear to be meant in any one of them. Indeed such a place of punishment could not be learned by the Jews, either from the ancient Magian religion or from Zoroaster's improvements of it, for not a word is said about hell in either. I have shown, in my first Inquiry, that Hades or hell as a place of future punishment was learned by the Jews from their intercourse with the Greeks. See chap. i, sec. 3.

3d. What were the opinions of the Apocryphal writers, *concerning the number that should be saved?*—Their opinion was, that all men "shall not be saved." See 2 Esdras viii. 38—42. On the contrary, the Most High "made this world for many, but the world to come for few. See 2 Esd. viii. 1. And in verse 3 it is said—"there be many created, but few shall be saved." And chap. ix. 15, "there be many more of them which perish, than of them which shall be saved." No sentiment like this is to be found in the Magian creed, or in its improvements by Zoroaster, so far as my knowledge of them extends. Where the Apocryphal writers learned it I am unable to say with certainty: but Whitby on Rom. ii. shows that the Jews in our Lord's day, believed that none but Jews were to be saved, and they were all to be saved. They believed that all the Gentiles were fuel for hell fire. My opinion is, that this idea originated among the Jews, from their hatred of the Gentiles, and the high opinion which they entertained of themselves as the seed of Abraham. See Matth. ch. iii. No one we think will contend, that they learned such an opinion from their

Scriptures. Christians in time past, have not only believed that few will be saved, but they express themselves pretty much in the language of the Apocryphal writers on the subject. Of late, Dr. Woods, Mr. Emerson, and some other orthodox writers aver, that the greater part of the human race will be saved. The number, who shall suffer eternal punishment, will not be more in proportion to the whole human race, than those who suffer capital punishment in any country, are to that of the whole community. We ought not to despise the day of small things. But this is a great thing, for not long ago, it was the orthodox faith, that comparatively few of the human race would be saved.

4th. What were the opinions of the Apocryphal writers *concerning immediate punishment after death?*—That they believed the wicked were punished after death is evident from 2 Esdras, vii. 47. And that it commenced *immediately* after death seems also evident from verse 56, and ix. 12. Compare also Eccles. xviii. 22—25. This is precisely the doctrine of immediate punishment after death taught in our day. But I would ask, from what source did the Apocryphal writers learn this doctrine? Not from the Old Testament, for it is now conceded by intelligent orthodox men, that the Old Testament does not teach it. It was impossible they could learn it from the New, for when they wrote, it was not in existence. Not from Zoroaster, for I do not find that his creed contained the doctrine of immediate punishment after death. Where could the Jews then learn such a doctrine? I answer, from the Greeks, from whom also they learned that *Hades* ,or *Hell* was the place where this punishment was to be suffered. See first Inquiry, chap. i, sect. 3. The Old Testament writers, so far from teaching the doctrine of immediate punishment after death, describe this state,

as a state of darkness, silence, insensibility, and that there the very best of men cannot praise God or give him thanks. Nor is a single individual ever represented as in pain or misery in this state. But the Greeks believed in immediate happiness as well as misery after death, and the Apocryphal writers believed both. See Eccles. i. 13, 2 Esdras, xiv. 34, and vii. 28, 35, 2 Mac. vii. 14, Wisdom of Sol. chap. ii. See Jahn's Arch. p. 398, quoted above.

5th. What were the opinions entertained by the writers of the Apocrypha concerning "*the day of judgment?*" The phrase, "the day of judgment," only occurs once in the Old Testament, Prov. vi. 34, where no one ever supposed it referred to a day of general judgment at the end of this world. But in this sense, the phrase, "the day of judgment," is used by Zoroaster in his creed. And in this sense also it is used by the Apocryphal writers; 2 Esdras, xii. 34; Esther, i. 11. That they meant a day of judgment after the resurrection of the dead seems evident from the following passages. The torment of the wicked at this period they believed to be "fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall feel them, and weep forever." See Judith, xvi. 17, Eccles. vii. 17, Comp. 2 Esdras, ii. 34, and vi. 9, 25. Suffer me now to ask, where could the writers of the Apocrypha learn the doctrine of "the day of judgment" but from the creed of Zoroaster, for this is both the sentiment and the very phraseology which he uses as has been seen above from Prideaux. It cannot be questioned, that the phrase "the day of judgment" does not once occur in the Old Testament in this sense. If it is denied, that they learned this sentiment from the creed of Zoroaster, show us from what Divine source they could learn it? As Christians could not learn either this sentiment or the language in which

it is expressed from the Old Testament, we ask how came they by such sentiments and language, unless they derived it from Zoroaster's creed or at second hand from the Apocrypha. It will not answer to say, Jesus Christ and his apostles used the phrase "the day of judgment," and Christians have borrowed the language and sentiment from them. No, this will never do, for first, we have shown in our answer to Mr. Sabine, that in no text where this language is used is such a sentiment conveyed by it. But second, if we were even to grant this, what would follow from it. It would follow, that Jesus Christ and his apostles adopted the sentiments and language of the Apocryphal writers, or to speak all the truth, that both were indebted to the great impostor, Zoroaster, for inventing both the sentiment and language for them some hundred years before. Yea, that all of them were indebted to the ancient creed of the Magians for this doctrine and the language in which it is expressed, for both are found there. Let our brethren, then, who contend for this doctrine, consider its origin; for to build their faith on the New Testament as its source, is worse than the Old; it makes the writers not revealers of a new doctrine, nor teaching one before revealed, but adopting a sentiment and language, which originated in the Magian creed, was transmitted by the great impostor Zoroaster, and the Apocryphal writers to Jesus Christ and his apostles, and from them to all Christians ever since.

6th. What are the opinions taught by the Apocryphal writers, respecting the *duration of future punishment?* Their opinion about this was, that it should never end Thus in Judith, xvi. 17, where, speaking of the wicked it is said—"The Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment, in putting fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall

feel them and weep forever." Bad as the ancient Magian religion was, it does not appear to have taught the endless duration of punishment. And, if Jahn is to be believed, as quoted above, Zoroaster's disciples taught that the wicked were to be purified by fire at the day of judgment, and made happy with the good. It is certain the ancient Greeks believed in endless punishment, and from this source, or the creed of Zoroaster, the Apocryphal writers must have derived it. They could not learn such a doctrine from the Old Testament scriptures, for it is not taught there. Many contend that it is taught in the New Testament. Allowing it is, I ask how the writers of the Apocrypha came to believe it and teach it long before the New Testament was written? Did the New Testament writers adopt a doctrine, taught by Apocryphal writers, which they derived from the heathen? This to be sure would be doing great honor to them, but what comes of the honor, or credit of Christ and his apostles if this was admitted?

Such are the religious opinions found in the Apocrypha, all closely connected with our present inquiry. We would candidly ask our orthodox brethren, how those writers came to speak so clearly and explicitly on these topics, long before the New Testament was written? As their information could not be derived from the Old Testament, where did they obtain it?—Did Daniel reveal it to the Jews while they were in Babylon? If he did, why was it mixed up with such fables as are found in the Apocrypha, and transmitted to posterity by Apocryphal writers? And, if such opinions be true, why did the New Testament writers not avail themselves of such explicit information, and teach them to the world? No man, we think, will affirm that such opinions are taught so explicitly in the

New Testament as they are in the Apocrypha. And Christians cannot well deny, that the sentiments and even the language of their creeds, bear a greater resemblance to what is found in the Apocrypha, than any thing taught either in the Old or New Testament.—Many doubt the truth of such articles. But could any man have disputed their truth, had the Apocrypha been a part of divine revelation?

7th. What were the religious opinions among the Jews not found in Scripture, during the days of Christ and his apostles? The New Testament itself affords evidence that opinions prevailed not found in their Scriptures. For example, our Lord told the Jews, in general terms, that they had made God's law void, through their traditions. See some of these opinions noticed in the quotations from L'Enfant, Jahn and others, above. Other opinions we shall have occasion to notice in succeeding Sections. See also Whitby on Romans ii, referred to above. The opinions of Josephus concerning a state of future rewards and punishments are well known, and need not be quoted. Those who wish to see a pretty full account of the opinions of the Sadducees, Pharisees, and other sects among the Jews, may consult Prideaux, vol. iii. pp. 353—389. See also Jahn's Arch. pp. 402—404, 411, which my limits forbid quoting. Nor is it necessary, for it would only be to repeat opinions already noticed.

8th. The history of the Christian church shows, that many heathen opinions were incorporated with Christianity, and increased from bad to worse, until what was called Christianity, became worse than heathenism itself. The first converts were Jews, and vast multitudes of converts were also made from among the Gentiles. Such continued to retain many

of their former false opinions. When Christianity became the religion of the Roman empire, men, formerly heathen priests and philosophers, became teachers in the Christian church, so that it soon became popular, but greatly corrupted. Those who wish to see this gradual corruption traced and exposed, may consult Dr. Campbell's Ecclesiastical History, Mosheim's Church History, Milner's, and others. The fact is notorious, and universally admitted, and my limits forbid a more particular statement. We shall conclude this section by noticing the following facts.

1st. The whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, which has so long been the Diana of the religious world, was the invention of Zoroaster. Prideaux, vol. i. p. 230, thus writes: "And whether it were, that these Magians thought it would bring the greater credit to them, or the kings, that it would add a greater sacredness to their persons, or whether it were from both these causes, the royal family among the Persians, as long as this sect prevailed among them, was always reckoned of the sacerdotal tribe. They were divided into three orders. The lowest were the inferior clergy, who served in all the common offices of their divine worship: next above them were the superintendents, who in their several districts governed the inferior clergy, as the bishops do with us; and above all was the Archimagus, or arch-priest, who, in the same manner as the high priest among the Jews, or the Pope now among the Romanists, was the head of the whole religion. And, according to the number of their orders, the churches or temples in which they officiated were also of three sorts. The lowest sort were the parochial churches, or oratories, which were served by the inferior clergy, as the parochial churches are now with us; and the duties which they there performed were

to read the daily offices out of their liturgy, and at stated and solemn times, to read some part of their sacred writings to the people. In these churches there were no fire altars; but the sacred fire, before which they here worshipped, was maintained only in a lamp. Next above these were their fire temples, in which fire was continually kept burning on a sacred altar. And these were, in the same manner as cathedrals with us, the churches or temples where the superintendents resided. In every one of these were also several of the inferior clergy entertained, who, in the same manner as the choral vicars among us, performed all the divine offices under the superintendent, and also took care of the sacred fire, which they constantly watched day and night, by four and four, in their turns, that it might always be kept burning, and never go out. The highest church above all was the fire temple, where the Archimagus resided, which was had in the same veneration with them as the temple of Mecca among the Mahometans, to which every one of that sect thought themselves obliged to make a pilgrimage once in their lives. Zoroaster first settled it at Balch, and there he, as their Archimagus, usually had his residence. But after the Mahometans had overrun Persia, in the seventh century after Christ, the Archimagus was forced to remove from thence into Kerman, which is a province in Persia, lying upon the Southern ocean, towards India, and there it hath continued even to this day. And to the fire temple there erected, at the place of his residency, do they now pay the same veneration as formerly they did to that of Balch. This temple of the Archimagus, as also the other fire temples, were endued with large revenues in lands: but the parochial clergy depended solely on the tithes and offerings of the people; for this

usage also had Zoroaster taken from the Jewish church, and made it one of the establishments among his Magians."

Let it be remembered, that Dean Prideaux was a prophet of their own, which forbids the slightest surmise that this account is either misrepresented or exaggerated. But, while eating the fat, and clothing himself with the wool, arising from such an establishment, he frankly confesses that it was invented by Zoroaster, concerning whom he says, p. 220—"He was the greatest impostor, except Mahomet, that ever appeared in the world, and had all the craft and enterprising boldness of that Arab." A very good origin indeed for—"Mystery Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." It was surely proper, that the greatest imposition ever palmed on the world, should be the invention of one of the greatest impostors the world ever produced. As it was invented at Babylon, published at Babylon, and imported from Babylon, it is very properly called—"Mystery Babylon the great." After such a disclosure by one of the craftsmen, that man must be dead drunk with the wine of her fornications, who still continues to cry—"great is Diana of the Ephesians."

2d. Another fact is, that all sects and parties in religion, are silent about the religion of Zoroaster. The Ecclesiastical hierarchy has met with both assault and insult from almost every sect. But in the course of our reading we have never met with any one of them who ventured to expose it as an invention of Zoroaster. Many a prayer has been made for the downfall of Mahomet and the destruction of Paganism: but who ever heard a prayer made for the destruction of Magianism or the religion of Zoroaster? But why

not? Is it not because the creeds of the different sects and that of Zoroaster are very similar? From his Lord God the Pope, down to the lowest dissenter, all firmly hold some articles invented by Zoroaster. It would not do for any of the sects to insult the clergy, by telling them that Zoroaster was the inventor of their ecclesiastical establishment. No, they could retort upon them, for if this was any argument against it, they must admit it was of equal force against such articles of their own creeds, as Zoroaster was the inventor of both. If they attacked the hierarchy with such a weapon as this they wounded themselves, and if the building fell by such an assault, their own creeds must be demolished with it. The base born origin of the Mother of Harlots must be concealed, for every grade of relationship, however distant, must share in the disgrace. Dean Prideaux loved the inventions of Zoroaster, but called him the greatest impostor that ever arose, Mahomet excepted. But instead of this kind of abuse, the religious world ought to erect a monument to his memory, for to him, more than to Jesus Christ, have they been indebted for much that has been counted great, glorious, and good in religion.

3d. It has been noticed by many as a remarkable fact, that before the captivity the Jews were prone to idolatry, but after their return and ever since, have held it in great abhorrence. Is not this great change in the Jews, partly, at least, accounted for by their imbibing Zoroaster's opinions, which were opposed to the worship of idols? But this I merely suggest for consideration, and leave the reader to his own reflections, on the topics which have been discussed in the present Section.

SECTION V.

ALL THE PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHERE THE TERM SATAN OCCURS, CONSIDERED.

The term *Satan* among Christians, is as much a proper name for a fallen angel, as Peter and Paul are for two of Christ's apostles. In correction of this mistake, Dr. Campbell says, Dissert. 6, "Satan, though conceived by us as a proper name, was an appellative in the language spoken by our Lord; for, from the Hebrew it passed into the Syriac, and signified no more than adversary or opponent. It is naturally just as applicable to human as to spiritual agents, and is, in the Old Testament, often so applied." The truth of this statement we have seen, Sect. iii.

It has been alleged that the New Testament speaks more frequently and explicitly about the *devil* and *satan* than the Old. Let us see how this matter stands. The term satan occurs thirty-four times in the Old Testament, and is fifteen times rendered *adversary*, or by some similar word. But though it occurs thirty-five times in the New Testament, it is not rendered by any word. It is easily perceived, then, that this circumstance gives to the New Testament the appearance of teaching the existence of such a being, which the Old has not. But every man must see, that it is a very false appearance, and is very much increased from the very frequent occurrence of the term *devil*, and the plural *devils*, to which, like the term *satan*, people have attached the idea of a fallen angel. But it is well known, that the words

daimon and *daimonion*, have no reference to that being Christians call *the devil*, but to demons or dead men deified, as we shall see in the sequel. The word *diabolos*, occurs in the New Testament thirty-six times. Excluding all the other places where the words *devil* and *devils* are the rendering of *daimon* and *daimonion*, all must see what an alteration it makes on the face of the New Testament. Even in our English version the term *diabolos* is sometimes rendered *slanderer* and *false accuser*, as the word signifies. Dr. Campbell, where Judas is called a devil, renders it *spy*, and *diabolos* is rendered in a similar manner by other translators. Supposing then, that the words *shaitan* and *diabolos*, had been rendered *adversary* and *slanderer*, or by similar words, it would have been difficult to find a fallen angel under those names in the Bible. In the Old Testament the term satan signifies an adversary, and is applied to the angel of Jehovah, the evil passions of men, a piece of writing, the evil principle deified, &c. The term satan is used in a similar way in the New Testament, which we shall now proceed to show.

Matth. xvi. 23. "But he turned and said unto Peter, get thee behind me satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." See also the parallel text in Mark viii. 33, which I need not transcribe. Here our Lord does not say that Peter was possessed of satan, that he acted like him, or that he was influenced by him, but positively calls one of his own disciples *satan*. But was Peter a fallen angel or wicked spirit? The expression "*get thee behind me satan*," is the same that our Lord used, Luke iv. 8, when he was tempted of the devil and satan. There is nothing at all remarkable in calling Peter satan, as Da-

vid and the angel of the Lord were called so in the Old Testament. "Get thee behind me adversary," was highly proper language, for Peter was our Lord's *adversary*, not from design, but from ignorance and mistaken views, as is evident from the context, and also from the reason assigned; "For thou savorest not the things which be of God, but those which be of men." The Old and New Testament writers, therefore, perfectly harmonise in the sense attached to this word.

Luke xxii. 31, 32. "And the Lord said Simon, Simon, behold, satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat." Peter in the last text, was a *satan* or *adversary*, and now our Lord told him satan desired to sift him as wheat. But where in the history of Peter, do we find that an evil being ever attempted to injure him? But if we consult verses 32—35, and verses 54—63, of this chapter, we see that Peter was three times sifted like wheat, by being three times charged with being one of our Lord's disciples, and he as often denying him. Peter's faith seemed to fail him for a season, but our Lord prayed for him that it might not entirely fail. In Psalm cix, and other places noticed in Section iii, we have seen that the unbelieving Jews are called a satan or adversary to our Lord. Here they showed themselves so by sifting Peter as wheat, for their opposition was chiefly against the Saviour. To assert that a fallen angel influenced the Jews, has no evidence to support it from text or context. Indeed, only render the term satan *adversary*, and no one would think of a fallen angel as concerned in this affair. Our Lord only says, "behold, the adversary hath desired you that he may sift you as wheat."

Mark iii. 23. "And he called them unto him, and

said unto them in parables, how can satan cast out satan." See the whole context. The following remarks from Jahn are sufficient on this passage. He says, p. 226—"Jesus, in Matt. xii. 24—30, Mark iii. 22—30, Luke xi. 16—24, employs against the Pharisees this ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM, which has no bearing in this case any further than the refutation of the adversary is concerned. The ground of his employing this species of argument in the present instance was this. The Pharisees, if we may believe Josephus, taught that the *demons*, by which men were possessed, were the spirits of bad men, who were dead, and were commissioned on their present business of tormenting the children of men by Beelzebub. Jesus, therefore, replied, provided this were the true state of the case, that Beelzebub, by lending his assistance in casting out his own devils, was overturning his own kingdom. He then adds, that this powerful spirit, for such the Pharisees supposed him to be, could not be compelled to perform such an unwelcome task, unless a stronger one than Beelzebub himself, should first come, should bind him, and take away his arms."

Luke x. 18. "And he said unto them, I beheld satan as lightning fall from heaven." The following remarks from Jahn are also sufficient on this text. He says, p. 225—"Jesus, in Luke x. 17, does not assert the operations of demons in men, for he couples satans with serpents and scorpions, which places us under the necessity of interpreting *all* these words tropically, and of understanding by them cunning and powerful adversaries, who opposed the progress of the Gospel, but with all their power were unable to interrupt its advancement. The expressions which he employs are as follows. 'I see satan,' *i. e.* all the adver-

saries of the Gospel, who are afterwards called serpents, scorpions, and the enemy's host, 'fall like lightning from heaven,' *i. e.* from the political heaven, from power and authority. Consult Isai. xiv. 12, 13, Matt. 24th chapter, Luke x. 15, Revelation xii. 7—9; see also Cicero, where he says to Mark Antony, *you have hurled your colleagues down from heaven.* (The adversaries of the Gospel occur in Luke xxii. 31, under the name of *Satan.*) 'Behold, (he proceeds,) I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy,' *i. e.* of overcoming and subduing by your miraculous gifts all adversaries, 'and nothing shall by any means hurt you,' *i. e.* oppress and overcome you. 'Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven,' *i. e.* rejoice rather in the favor of God, than in the power of casting out devils, or of healing the most difficult diseases." In addition to these remarks I would ask, how many fallings from heaven has satan had, for he fell from heaven before he tempted Eve, and fell again it seems while the seventy disciples were on their tour of preaching? But how did he get to heaven to make a second fall from it, and while there, was he also walking about on our earth seeking whom he might devour?

Luke xiii. 16. "And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" Jahn on this passage says, p. 227—"Jesus liberates the woman, described in Luke xiii. 12, as bowed down with infirmity, without making any mention of a demon; if, therefore, a little after, he asserts, that she was a daughter of Abraham, bound by Satan for eighteen years, the expressions are to be considered

as figurative, being an allusion to the loosing of oxen, which it was lawful to do on the Sabbath in order to lead them to drink, and having reference at the same time to an opinion among the Jews, that all diseases had their ultimate origin, (not indeed from *demons*,) but from the Devil, that overruling spirit of wickedness, who tempted Eve, and to whom allusions are made in Acts x. 38, and in 2 Cor. xii. 7." Dr. Lightfoot on Matth. xvii. says—"that the Jews usually attributed some of the more grievous diseases to evil spirits, especially those in which either the body was distorted or the mind disturbed." Jahn and Dr. Lightfoot allow that such opinions existed among the Jews, and we have shown Sect. iv. how they came to imbibe them. But no countenance is given to the truth of the opinion, that a fallen angel was the cause of this woman's disorder. It is called "*a spirit of infirmity*." Dr. Campbell says, Dissert. vi.—"It is a common idiom among the Jews, to put *spirit* before any quality ascribed to a person, whether it be good or bad, mental or corporeal. Thus the spirit of fear, the spirit of meekness, the spirit of slumber, the spirit of jealousy, are used to express habitual fear," &c. *A spirit of infirmity* then, was an habitual infirmity, which was certainly true of this woman, for she could in no wise lift up herself "for eighteen years." This complaint medical men have called "*the rigidity of the back bone*."—Notice, when our Lord restored her, he does not command satan to leave this woman, nor does he rebuke him, but says—"woman, thou art loosed." Loosed from satan? No, thou art loosed from thine *infirmity*. This bound her, and was sufficient without his assistance. Notice further, that our Lord in the act of healing her "laid his hands on her, and immediately she was made straight and glorified God." The ruler

of the synagogue, speaking according to the true state of the case, spoke of this woman as laboring under a mere bodily disorder. He does not say—there are six days, in them come and be *loosed from satan's bondage*, but in them come and be *healed*, verse 14. He was filled with indignation because our Lord had *healed* her on the Sabbath. What was said by our Lord about satan, in defence of his conduct, is predicated on two grounds; 1st. On the principles of common humanity, which the Jews exercised towards their cattle on the Sabbath. "Thou hypocrite," says Jesus, "doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?"—What was the inference from this? Ought not this woman, a daughter of Ahraham, to be loosed from her infirmity on the Sabbath? 2d. He defends his conduct on the supposition that satan had bound this woman. If they believed this, how could they blame him for loosing her on the Sabbath day. Who could resist these reasons? Accordingly it is said, verse 17, that "all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him." But let us suppose, that satan positively was the cause of this woman's disorder, what follows? It follows, that our Lord, neither on this or any other occasion, warned men against his great power and malignity, nor were the people half so much alarmed, as they would have been, if a wild beast had visited their neighborhood. They showed no fear respecting such a powerful wicked being. Whoever contends that satan bound this woman, ought to contend, that all persons so bound now, and why not all diseases, are inflicted by him. If this be true, we are in a miserable condition. Medical men may scatter all their knowledge of the healing art to the winds, and henceforth

learn to work miracles, or cultivate the friendship of satan, as the only means left them of excelling in their profession.

Luke xxii. 3. "Then entered satan into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve."—If satan entered into Judas, was not Judas possessed of satan? But it is a fact, that though persons are said to have been possessed of demons, yet we never read of one who was possessed of the devil or satan. But how could satan be in Judas, tormenting the wicked in hell, and temping all the world besides, unless we make him almost equal to God himself? And if he did enter Judas for the purpose of working evil, is it not strange that some good angel did not also enter him to counter-work his evil devices? Well, what satan entered into Judas? I answer, *the spirit of opposition to Jesus, the purpose to betray him.* The 4th verse shows this, for "he went his way and communed with the chief priests and captains how he might betray him unto them." See on the next passage.

John xiii. 27. "And after the sop satan entered into him." What satan now entered Judas, for it was said in the preceding passage, that satan had entered into him? I answer, his *fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose.* It was just before the last Passover, Judas purposed to betray Jesus, and bargained with the chief priests about it, Matth. xxvi. 14—17. This purpose is called satan entering into him, Luke xxii. 1—7, and the devil putting it into his heart, John xiii. 2. But, from the time he formed the purpose, until he received the sop, none but himself, Jesus, and the chief priests knew his design. At verse 10, Jesus says, "ye are clean, but not all." Comp. verse 11.—Again, at verse 18, he says—"but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, he that eateth bread with me hath

lifted up his heel against me." But at verse 21, Jesus says plainly, "one of you shall betray me." This excited the inquiry, "Lord who is it?" To point the person out, Jesus says—"he it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop he gave it to Judas." The words before us immediately follow—"and after the sop satan entered into him." What connexion could there be betwixt his receiving the sop and a fallen angel entering into him? But there is a rational connexion between receiving the sop, and his determination to execute his purpose *immediately*. The delicate hints of guilt agitated Judas' mind: but giving him the sop, must have roused him to fury, as he was now openly exposed, and he departs to execute his design. The words which follow confirm this—"that thou doest do quickly."—These words, though not understood by the rest of the disciples, appear to have been well understood by Judas. They hastened his departure; for upon hearing them he went "immediately out." But where did he go to, and for what purpose? To his employers, the chief priests, that he might execute his determination. See Matth. xxvi. 47—50. What is a remarkable fact, and confirms the above view, satan is never said to have entered into the Jews. And why not? Because they had always been a *satan* or *adversary* to our Lord.—But Judas had been one of Christ's professed friends, and the same *satan* which had always been in the Jews, entered into him when he formed the design to betray Jesus, and also when he determined to execute his design. To this day, when a man acts a very wicked part, contrary to his former professions, we in popular language say, "satan has entered into him." Besides, the view given is in agreement with the Old Testa

ment usage of the term satan, where it is applied to the evil principles and bad passions in men.

Acts v. 3. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost and to keep back part of the price of the land?" It is not said that satan entered into Ananias, but only that he had *filled his heart.* But what is meant by the words —"why hath satan filled thine heart," is in verse 4 thus explained—"why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart." Here two things are obvious. First, what in the one sentence is said to be done by *satan*, is in the other ascribed to *Ananias* himself; and second, what is meant by satan *filling* the heart, is explained to mean, Ananias *conceiving this thing in his heart.* It seems to be an Hebrew idiom, and is illustrated by the words of Ahasuerus to Esther the queen. "Who is he? And where is he that durst presume in his heart to do so?" It is in the margin—"*whose heart hath filled him.*" See Esth. vii. 5. Notice further, it is not said satan had filled the heart of Sapphira, verse 9, Peter only says to her—"how is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the spirit of the Lord?" But why? for she lied as well as her husband. This is accounted for by considering, that great or uncommon instances of natural or moral evil among the Jews were ascribed to satan. Peter speaks at the outset, of the greatness of the sin of lying to the Holy Spirit; in the popular language of the times: but he had also explained his meaning, or spoken according to the true state of the case, by saying, "why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart?" After this it would have been incongruous to introduce again the popular language about satan in speaking to Sapphira. Peter's explanation of the popular language—"why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart," agrees precisely

with James' account how people are tempted to sin, chap. i. 13, 14. James does not allow any man to say when he is tempted, that he is tempted of God, for God tempteth no man. But if it be true, that Ananias was, or any man is tempted of satan, would he not allow them to say the truth? But James expressly declares that every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own *lust*. Ananias and his wife were drawn away by their lust or love of money. This satan filled their heart, and they were enticed by it to lie to the Spirit of God. But had a fallen angel enticed them, why is he never blamed for it by those whom he seduced?—Did David blame him? Did even Judas blame him? No, bad as he was, he takes all the blame to himself—"I have betrayed the innocent blood." Nor is satan ever threatened with any punishment. Ananias and his wife are struck dead for their crime, but if satan was the chief agent why does he escape? For a very good reason, there never was such a being to be punished.

Acts xxvi. 18. "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of satan unto God." The history of Paul's preaching does not afford an instance that he ever purposed, or actually did turn a single individual from the power of a fallen angel, called the devil or satan. Had such a remarkable thing happened, it would have been noticed, and the person congratulated on account of his deliverance. He turned many from the power of *the adversary*, for it is said he turned away much people, saying they were no Gods which were made with hands. Was there no satan or adversary but a fallen angel from which he could turn men? The persecuting Jews are called satan. Peter was called satan.—And surely the whole system of ignorance and superstition, upheld by priests and civil rulers, was a satan

or adversary. See this more fully shown on Eph. vi. 11, in the next Section. From this satan many were turned, as the history of the Acts of the Apostles shows. Comp. Col. i. 13, where we read of men turned from "*the power of darkness.*" Accordingly some read the passage before us thus: "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, *even* from the power of satan unto God." The darkness of ignorance, superstition, and wickedness, were the satan from which Paul turned men, and this he did by the light of the glorious gospel of Christ.

Rom. xvi. 20. "And the God of peace shall bruise satan under your feet shortly." It is not easily conceived how a fallen angel was bruised under the feet of Christians in the apostolic age. It does not accord with fact, and satan is now believed to be as subtle, powerful, and active as ever. The term satan is frequently used to designate the persecuiing Jews, and this declaration of the apostle is agreeable to the fact, for they were bruised under the feet of Christians in the destruction of their city and temple, and dispersed among all nations as our Lord predicted, Matth. xxiv. At this period the disciples of Jesus had rest from their persecutions.

1 Cor. v. 5. "To deliver such an one unto satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." The term *spirit*, is often used in Scripture as equivalent to *person*, or for the person himself. Paul certainly did not mean this person's *spirit* separate from his body, for it does not appear, that his punishment included such a separation: nor that it was to be punished to the end of the world and then saved, for he says nothing about the destruction or punishment of this spirit. Besides, the common belief is, that unless persons' spirits are saved be-

fore death, they never can be saved after it? If satan was a fallen angel to whom this person was delivered, it is rather strange, that such a being should be in any way the instrument of salvation. Besides, if the day of the Lord here means the end of this world, and *spirit* a part of man which exists separate from the body, why is the salvation of his spirit only mentioned? One should rather think, that it would be the flesh that required salvation from the hands of satan, for he was to destroy the *flesh* that the spirit might be saved. It is well known, that the term *satan* signifies an adversary. It is often applied to the adversaries of Christians and Christianity. This person in the church at Corinth was guilty of incest. See verse 1. The apostle commanded them to deliver him over to this satan, or to put him away from among themselves, verse 13.—This was to be done for the person's good, the destruction or punishment of the flesh, or to bring him to repentance, and that he might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. The first question that arises here is, what day of the Lord Jesus is meant? I answer, that day which our Lord had forewarned his disciples of, and in view of which he exhorted them to be found watchful and faithful. See Matth. xxiv. Well, what kind of salvation did the apostle mean, when he said, 'that the spirit or person may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus?' I answer the same kind of salvation enjoyed by all those who endured to the end. Matth. xxiv. 13. This person was not believing to the salvation of his soul or person, but was drawing back to perdition.—He was not looking for his Lord's coming, but was saying by his conduct, my Lord delayeth his coming. Such were the means prescribed for converting this sinner from the error of his way, and saving a soul or person from death, and hiding a multitude of sins. The

means proved effectual, as is evident from 2 Cor. ii. where Paul commands the Corinthians to forgive him, and to confirm their love to him; and assigns as a reason why they should do so, 'lest satan should get an advantage of us; for we are not ignorant of his devices.' What satan, pray? The very same satan or the adversaries of the gospel, to whom this person was delivered for the destruction of the flesh."

1 Tim. i. 20. "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." The remarks on the last text are sufficient here.

1 Cor. vii. 5. "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that satan tempt you not for your incontinency." At Corinth, prostitution formed a part of the worship of the gods. To avoid fornication, the apostle commands that every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, verse 2. But if the one defrauded the other, the defrauded, in such a place as Corinth, was liable to be tempted by satan, or the adversaries of the gospel, to licentiousness. To guard them against bringing such a reproach on Christ's name, this injunction was delivered. Comp. verse 4, where their mutual rights are stated. But somewhat of a different view may be given of this passage in agreement with the Scripture usage of the term satan. It sometimes designates lust or sinful desire, which might, if the one defrauded the other, prove a satan or adversary to tempt them to licentious indulgence.

2 Cor. ii. 11. "Lest satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices." See on 1 Cor. v. 5, above, for the meaning of this text. I may just add, that the Scripture usage of the term satan,

would warrant us to say, that an unforgiving temper of mind was the satan here referred to. It is surely *an adversary* to a Christian, and gets an advantage over him if he indulges it.

2 Cor. xi. 14. "And no marvel; for satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." The whole context goes to show that the apostle is speaking of human beings. He speaks 1st. Of satan, which simply means an adversary; and we think it indisputable that this term is applied both in the Old and New Testaments to the unbelieving and persecuting Jews. They were transformed into an angel of light, for their opposition was under the pretence of great zeal for God and the law. It is implied, that in reality they were the angel of darkness, considered by Zoroaster the author and director of all evil. This was indeed the case with the Jews, for they were the authors and directors of all the opposition to Christians and Christianity, as the New Testament shows. 2d. The apostle also speaks of the "*ministers*" of this satan. No one we think can dispute, that the apostle calls the false teachers in the church at Corinth the ministers of satan. They were transformed as ministers of righteousness, for under pretence of preaching the gospel they perverted it. See verses 3, 4, 12, 13, 15. They preached another gospel, see Gal. i. 6—10. Compare Acts xv. 1, &c. Gal. v. 1—7, and many other passages. They were in heart opposed to the Gospel, and were in fact joined with the unbelieving Jews, in opposing the truth and the apostles who preached it. They were the ministers or assistants of the Jews, who were the open and avowed adversaries of Christianity. If satan was transformed into an angel of light, there was no cause to marvel, that his ministers should transform themselves into the apostles of Christ, and as ministers of right-

eousness. The apostle says concerning them, "whose end shall be according to their works." What end? The apostle tells us that their end "is destruction," Phil. iii. 18, 19. The same destruction which came on the unbelieving Jews whose ministers they were, see Phil. i. 28, 29; 1 Peter iv. 17, 18. See particularly on Matth. xxiv. xxv, and 2 Thess. ii. in the Second Part.

2 Cor. xii. 7. "And lest I should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." The word which is here translated messenger is *angelos*, and which in other places is rendered angel. It was "the angel of satan," that buffeted Paul. Dr. Kennicott says, Dissert. i. p. 100, "For the *messenger of satan* means here a false teacher, in opposition to a true apostle called '*the messenger of God*,' Gal. iv. 14." See Parkhurst on the word Angelos: and on the last passage for the satan here meant.

1 Thess. ii. 18. "Wherefore we would have come unto you (even I Paul) once and again; but satan hindered us." Acts xvii. 1 Thess. iii. 1—9, with many other passages show, that the satan who hindered Paul from going to the Thessalonians, was the persecuting Jews, who are frequently called satan. Nothing in Paul's history shows a fallen angel ever troubled him. Only render the term satan, adversary here, and in other places, and such a being disappears.

2 Thess. ii. 9. "Even him, whose coming is after the working of satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders." The apostle simply says here, "whose coming is after the working of the adversary." If this is understood of the persecuting Jews, who are called satan in other texts, it is agreeable to the fact, for many

came in Christ's name before the destruction of Jerusalem, pretending to work miracles, so that if it had been possible they would have deceived the very elect. See Matth. xxiv. and Whitby on 2 Thess. chap. ii.

1 Tim. v. 15. "For some are already turned aside after satan." What satan had they turned aside after? The words which immediately precede show this: "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the *adversary* to speak reproachfully." The *satan*, after whom they had turned aside, was evidently the Jews, for they are called both satan and adversary in other texts, and they did speak reproachfully of Christians. It is not easily perceived, how persons could turn aside after a fallen angel, but to apostatise from the faith, or go over to its adversaries, is easily understood.

Rev. ii. 9. "I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich,) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of satan." Who a true Jew was, Paul informs us, Rom. ii. 28, 29. The persons spoken of, *said they were Jews*, but *were not*. They were of synagogue of satan, belonged to the synagogue of the unbelieving persecuting Jews. Who ever supposed that a fallen angel had a synagogue, and, that the persons John speaks of belonged to it? Nor can it be believed, any number of men had a synagogue in those days, which was called "the synagogue of satan," or of a fallen angel. But the synagogue of the Jews, or the adversary, occasions no difficulty.

Rev. iii. 9. "Behold I will make them of the synagogue of satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." See on the last passage a sufficient illustration

of this text. I would only add, that it has been thought by some, there is an allusion here to the subjection of Jews to the Christians in the flourishing state of Christianity.

Rev. ii. 13. "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where satan's seat is: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr who was slain among you, where satan dwelleth." If satan here means a fallen angel, it must be admitted, that his seat was at Pergamus in the days of John. But if satan is only rendered adversary, all difficulty is at once removed. Pergamus was a noted place for opposition to Christianity, for here Antipas suffered death, and Christ's disciples are highly commended for holding fast his name in such a place of persecution. It will not be easy to show how a wicked spirit had his seat or throne at Pergamus, and at the same time was walking about seeking whom he might devour.

Rev. ii. 24. "But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, (as many as have not this doctrine, and who have not known the depths of satan, as they speak) I will put upon you none other burden." Here again it is only necessary to translate the word satan adversary, and all idea of a fallen angel disappears.—The deep things, or depths of satan, are the depths of the adversary. It is said that the Gnostics called their mysteries the deep things of God and the deep things of Bythus. And Lowman calls it the deep arts of deceit and error. Paul says, we are not ignorant of his devices, 2 Cor. ii. 11. And the whole conduct of the persecuting Jews is a comment on this passage and others above considered.

Such are all the places in the New Testament where the word satan occurs, and it is evident, the Old and

New Testament usage of it are similar, or rather the same. In neither does it designate a fallen angel, whom Christians call the devil and satan.

SECTION VI.

ALL THE PASSAGES WHERE THE ORIGINAL TERM DIABOLOS, TRANSLATED DEVIL, IS USED, CONSIDERED.

We have seen that the term *satan* means *an adversary*, and have noticed its various applications by the sacred writers. We are now to pay some attention to the *meaning* and *application* of the term (*diabolos*) devil, where it occurs in the New Testament.

Let it be then observed, in general, that the term *devils* is used in the following places in the Old Testament. "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto *devils*, after whom they have gone a whoring.—They sacrificed unto *devils*, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. And Jeroboam ordained him priests for the high places, and for the devils, and for the calves which he had made. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils." Lev. xvii. 7; Deut. xxxii. 17; 2 Chron. xi. 15; Psalm cvi. 37. The word rendered *devils* in this last text is *daimonion* in the Seventy's version, and also in the following places: Psalm xcvi. 5, and xci. 6; Isai. lxv. 10, xxxiv. 14 and xiii. 21. It is evident, these *devils*, or *demons*, were only heathen idols, or Pagan deities, which could

neither do good nor evil to any man. They were *made*, and some of them were styled *new gods*, which had come newly up, and which were not formerly known by the Jews or their fathers. To these *demons* or gods, the Jews sacrificed their sons and daughters. But they were altogether different from what is meant by the devil or satan; for as Dr. Campbell observes—"They could no more be said to have worshipped the devil, as we Christians understand the term, than they could be said to have worshipped the cannibals of New Zealand: because they had no more conception of the one than of the other." Dissert. vi. He adds, "As to the worship of the devil, *tou diabolous*, nothing can be clearer than that in Scripture, no Pagans are charged with it." The fact is, the Jews knew nothing about the devil until they went to Babylon. Dr. Campbell says, "The word *diabolos*, in its *ordinary* acceptation, signifies *calumniator*, *traducer*, *false accuser*, from the verb *diaballein*, to calumniate." This is also its meaning, as given by Parkhurst and other lexicographers, which need not be quoted. Its *extraordinary* acceptation, with them and others is, it designates a fallen angel, who is the implacable enemy of God and man.—But the first three passages which I shall quote, show that our translators understood the word *diabolos* in the way Dr. Campbell explains it, which he says, is its *ordinary* acceptation. The first is

1 Tim. iii. 11. "Even so must their wives be grave, not *slanderers* (*diabolous*,) sober, faithful in all things." Here pious women are exhorted not to be slanderers; literally, "not to be devils." The very same word is used, verses 6, 7, in the singular number, and is rendered devil. Again, it is said, Titus ii. 3, "the aged women likewise, that they be in behavior as becometh holiness, not *false accusers*" (*diabolous.*) Aged, pious

women are exhorted not to be *devils!* Again, 2 Tim. iii. 3, speaking of those who in the last days should have a form of godliness but denying the power of it, they are said to be "without natural affection, truce-breakers, *false accusers*" (*diaboloi*). Literally, devils. Suffer me now to ask, why in these texts the word was not rendered devils? The reason is obvious; it would appear very strange to our ears to exhort Christian women not to be devils, for we have associated the idea of a fallen angel with this word as we have with the term satan. It would have been a similar impropriety, had the angel of the Lord, David, and others been called *satan.* But to avoid this, satan is rendered adversary in the Old Testament, and in the above texts, the term *diabolos* is rendered *slanderer* and *false accuser.* These texts however, show us, both how it was understood by the apostle and also by our translators. Let the reader keep these remarks in view, while we consider all the other texts, where the term *diabolos* occurs in the New Testament.

John vi. 70. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Dr. Campbell renders the term *diabolos* here *spy*, and Newcome and Wakefield, render it *accuser.* This is an agreement with the preceding texts, and further remark is unnecessary.

John xiii. 2. "And supper being ended (the devil having now put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him)." See on Luke xxii. 3, and John xiii. 27, in the last Section, as a sufficient explanation of this passage. What is said to be done by satan in one, is said to be done by the devil in the other. Suffer me here to ask, When one man betrays another in our day, is the plea sustained in court or any where else, that the devil urged him on to it? And, would any man hang himself, if he believed he

was the tool of such a powerful and malicious being? Judas' crime is wholly imputed to himself, Acts i. 17, 18. And every man is conscious when he sins, that he did not need the assistance of such a being. The Scriptures, in plain language, refer sin to ourselves and not to the devil. See James i. 14, and Mark vii. 21, 22.

1 Peter v. 8, 9. "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist, steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." As this is one of the principal texts quoted in proof of the existence of an evil being, called the devil, I shall consider it particularly. We have then, 1st. An exhortation, "be sober, be vigilant." This was addressed to Christians scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, &c., chap. i. 1. It is so plain, they were suffering persecution from the enemies of the gospel, that it would be loss of time to give any proof of it. 2d. We have next the reason assigned why this exhortation should be obeyed. Why be sober and vigilant? "Because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." It is confidently believed by many good people, that this devil who walketh about like a roaring lion, is a fallen angel, or malignant spirit. But I ask, how is such a belief to be reconciled with his having his abode in hell, with some in the air, and others, his tempting men in all parts of the earth at the same time? Such a belief is contrary to all facts and experience. Did ever any person see the devil in the shape of a lion, hear him roar, or is an instance on record in the history of mankind of one being devoured by him? Such idle, childish stories have been told of

the devil, but what man in our day gives the least credit to them. I find human beings are frequently compared to lions—Numb. xxiii. 24; xxiv. 8, 9; Jer. l. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 17; also to roaring lions, Psal. xxii. 13; Prov. xix. 12; xx. 2; Jer. ii. 15; Isai. v. 29. They are also compared to a devouring lion, Psalm xvii. 12; xxii. 21; Jer. ii. 30; iv. 7; Ezek. xix. 1—6: xxii. 25. On examination I also find that God is compared to a lion and a roaring lion, Isai. xxxi. 4; Hosea xi. 10; xiii. 7, 8; Amos iii. 4—8. Not one instance can I find where the devil, a fallen angel, is compared to a lion. If he is so in this passage, it is a solitary instance, which is presumptive evidence that this was not the apostle's meaning. Who then was this roaring lion? Peter answers by saying, "*your adversary* the *devil*. The word here rendered *adversary* is *antidikos*. It only occurs in this and the following texts in the New Testament, Matth. v. 25; Luke xii. 58; xviii. 3. Parkhurst says, it means "an adversary or opponent in a law-suit," and quotes Herodian in proof of it. The text under consideration, is the only one in which he considers this word to mean a fallen angel or the devil. He desires us to compare Rev. xii. 10; Job i. 9; ii. 3, and Zach. iii. 1, in proof that *antidikos* in this text means such a wicked spirit. It is very plain that he considered adversary and devil to mean the same thing. We have not only compared, but have considered the passages, Section iii., and our readers may judge from the evidence we have adduced if they teach such a doctrine. In short, to say that the word *devil*, or the word *adversary* here used as its explanation, refers to a fallen angel, is taking for granted the very question at issue.—Who then was this adversary, who went about like a roaring lion? By recurring to the New Testament

usage of *antikeimai*, also rendered adversary, we shall see this.

1st. It is rendered *adversary* and applied to men who were the adversaries of Christ and of Christianity, particularly the persecuting Jews. Thus, when our Lord had refuted the Jews who had found fault with him for healing a person on their Sabbath, it is said—"all his *adversaries* were ashamed," Luke xiii. 17. He also said to his disciples—"I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your *adversaries* shall not be able to gainsay nor resist," Luke xxi. 15.—Again, Paul says, 1 Cor. xvi. 9.—"For a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many *adversaries*." And Philip. i. 28, he says,—"And in nothing terrified by your *adversaries*: which is to them an evident token of perdition." And in 1 Tim. v. 14, he exhorteth young women to conduct themselves as to give "none occasion to the *adversary* to speak reproachfully." In all these texts the adversaries of the gospel, particularly the Jews are referred to by the term *adversary*.

2d. It is rendered by the words *opposeth* and *contrary*, and applied to the following things. To the man of sin. "Who *opposeth* and exalteth himself above all that is called God," 2 Thess. ii. 4. To the opposition between flesh and spirit. "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and these are *contrary* the one to the other," Gal. v. 17. And in 1 Tim. i. 10, it is used to express whatever is opposed to the truth. "And if there be any other thing that is *contrary, or an adversary*, to sound doctrine." It is then beyond all fair debate, that *antikeimai*, *adversary*, is not once used in reference to the devil or satan, though most people say he is the greatest adversary of both God and man. The fact

is certain from the above texts, and the whole New Testament is an illustration of it, that the opposing Jews were the adversary of Christians and the chief cause of all their persecutions. They were the devil, the slanderer, or false accuser, who went about as a roaring lion seeking whom he might devour. See Acts xvii, and indeed all the New Testament. It is also evident, that the lusts and evil passions of men are termed *adversary* in several texts. And why are they termed so? I answer, because it is this devil or adversary within men, which makes them devils or adversaries in their conduct. I may add, the term satan we have seen signifies an adversary, and devil and satan are used synonimously in the New Testament, and both terms are used to express opposing persons and opposing things. That person or thing, is a devil, satan, or adversary to another which is opposed to it, The unbelieving, persecuting Jews are in scripture compared to a lion. Thus Paul says, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17.—"At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known and that all the Gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." It is thought by some, that by the lion, Paul referred to Nero or his prefect Helius Cesarianus, to whom he committed the government in his absence, with power to put to death whom he pleased. The reason given for this application of lion to Nero is, that Marsyas said to Agrippa when Tiberias died—"the lion is dead." Whether Paul ever heard this saying is uncertain, and if he had, we doubt whether his wisdom and prudence, in his then critical circumstances, would have allowed him to make such an al-

lusion. What leads me to conclude that Paul, by the lion, referred to his persecutors the Jews, are the following things:

1st. They actually went about like a lion to devour him, and at the time he wrote he was in bonds from their persecutions. Nero, nor any other Roman magistrate sought after Paul, until stirred up by the Jews. He was even obliged to appeal to Cæsar to be delivered from their hands.

2d. In Psalm xxii. 13, 21, where Christ and his enemies are spoken of, the persecuting Jews are expressly compared to a roaring lion. If Paul compared them to this, he had the example of David for it. To this Psalm probably Paul alluded in the passage before us.

3d. To understand the apostle by the lion, referring to the persecuting Jews, renders its usage uniform in the New Testament, but to understand it a fallen angel, is at variance with its entire usage throughout the Bible. It is agreeable to the fact, that the Jews went about as a roaring lion, but it is contrary to all facts and experience, that a fallen angel ever did this.—But Peter adds, "whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." The "afflictions" of Christians in the apostolic age arose from the persecuting Jews. Compare verse 10, and various other parts of the Epistle. But was a fallen angel in various places at the same time afflicting them? Besides, how could they resist steadfast in the faith an invisible spirit? It was with wicked men they had to contend, and from whom they suffered. See 1 Peter iv. 12; i. 7. The word devil, we have seen, signifies a slanderer or false accuser. Peter then says, in this passage,—"your adversary the slanderer or false ac-

cuser goeth about as a roaring lion." That this referred to men, no one, we think, can doubt who reads chap. ii. 12, 15, 20; iii. 15—17, and iv. 4, of this epistle. Nor will any one dispute, that the words *o' antidikos, 'umon diabolos* may be rendered thus: "the adversary your false accuser," or, "your adversary the false accuser." The whole epistle, is a comment on this view of the passage, nor would any one have ever thought of a fallen angel, had the word *diabolos* been rendered false accuser, as it is in some other places.—Common sense, and common scripture usage of words, lead to no other interpretation. It should be remembered Peter was a Jew, and was familiar with the meaning of the terms satan and devil. Jesus had called him satan, and Judas a devil; and could there be any impropriety in calling the persecutors of Christians "your adversary, the devil?" And on account of their ferocious cruelty comparing them to a roaring lion walking about seeking whom he might devour.

It is objected to this view of the passage—"the persecutors of Christians in Peter's day were *many*, but here he speaks of them as *one*." This objection has no force, for it is well known, that in Scripture the singular is frequently put for the plural, and the reverse. Besides, all know, that when many are spoken of collectively they are considered as one, and especially when they act in unison about any object. The persecutors of Christians were many, but never did many act more in unison about any object than they did in opposing Christians and Christianity. It is further objected—"Peter speaks emphatically of the devil, as if he was a real being, for he calls him *the devil*."—Answer; the word *diabolos* here is without the article, therefore this objection is without force. Even if it had been used, the objection would derive little or no

force from it, for it was very natural and proper for Peter to speak of the persecutors of Christians in this emphatic manner.

John viii. 44. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it." If the devil was the father of the unbelieving Jews whom our Lord here addressed, it is plain they were his sons or children. The question then is, what devil was their father? Professor Stuart shall inform us. In his letters to Dr. Miller, pp. 95—99, he thus writes:

"The word *son* was a favorite one among the Hebrews; and was employed by them, to designate a great variety of relations. The *son of any thing*, according to oriental idioms, may be either *what is closely connected with it, dependent on it, like it, the consequence of it, worthy of it, &c.* But this view of the subject must be explained, by actual examples from the Scriptures. The following I have selected from the Old and New Testaments.

"*The son of eight days, i. e.* the child that is eight days old; the *son of one hundred years, i. e.* the person who is one hundred years of age; the *son of a year, i. e.* a yearling; *the son of my sorrow, i. e.* one who has caused me distress; *the son of my right hand, i. e.* one who will assist or be a help to me; *son of old age, i. e.* begotten in old age; *son of valor, i. e.* bold, brave; *son of Belial*, [lit. son of good-for-nothing,] *i. e.* a worthless man: *son of wickedness, i. e.* wicked; *son of a murderer, i. e.* a murderous person; *son of my vows, i. e.* son that answers to my vows; *son of death, i. e.* one who deserves death; *son of perdition,*

i. e. one who deserves perdition ; *son of smiting*, *i. e.* one who deserves stripes ; *son of Gehenna*, *i. e.* one who deserves Gehenna ; *son of consolation*, *i. e.* one fitted to administer consolation ; *son of thunder*, *i. e.* a man of powerful, energetic eloquence or strength ; *son of peace*, *i. e.* a peaceable man ; *son of the morning*, *i. e.* morning star : *son of the burning coal*, *i. e.* sparks of fire ; *son of the bow*, *i. e.* an arrow ; *son of the threshing floor*, *i. e.* grain ; *son of oil*, *i. e.* fat ; *son of the house*, *i. e.* domestic or slave ; *son of man*, *i. e.* man, as it is usually applied ; but perhaps in a sense somewhat diverse, in several respects, as applied to the Saviour.

"Every kind of relation or resemblance whether real or imaginary, every kind of connexion, is characterised by calling it the son of that thing to which it stands thus related, or with which it is connected."

The Professor adds, "It will be remembered, however, that when we investigate the meaning of the phrase *son of the devil*, in the Scriptures, we are investigating the *usus loquendi* of a Shemitish dialect.—This will of course be conceded, in regard to the phrase in the Old Testament ; and I may add, that all critics are now agreed, that although the *words* of the New Testament are Greek, the idiom is Hebrew." Mr. Stuart then tells us that "*the son of any thing*, according to oriental idiom, may be either *what is closely connected with it*, *dependent on it*, *like it*, *the consequence of it*, *worthy of it*, *&c.*" He adds, "*every kind of relation or resemblance*, *whether real or imaginary*, *every kind of connexion is characterised by calling it the son of that thing to which it stands thus related*, *or with which it is connected.*" It is a plain case then, that if the Jews were of their father the devil, or sons of the devil, and if the term devil

means a *slanderer*, our Lord only told them that they were "slanderous persons." Were they not closely connected with slander, depended on it, were like it, and worthy of it? Mr. Stuart, by the above remarks, forever settles the question, that neither here nor any where else, son of the devil refers to a fallen angel.—I might here close my remarks, but I shall briefly notice what is further said in the passage, that we may see how it agrees with the view which he has given us. It is then said, "*and the lusts of your father ye will do.*" Well, did not the Jews slander the Saviour? They certainly did. But it is said, "*He was a murderer from the beginning.*" We have seen from the above quotation, that "son of wickedness," simply means "wicked;" and that "son of a murderer" signifies "a murderous person." That the Jews were murderous persons no one disputes. But, it will be said, how were the Jews murderous persons from the *beginning* of the world? This is not said. They are only said to have been "murderers from the *beginning.*" The term *arhes*, here rendered the beginning, is used to express, the beginning of our Lord's ministry and miracles, John viii. 25; vi. 64; xv. 27; xvi. 4; and ii. 11; 1 John i. 1; ii. 7, 13, 14, 24; and iii. 11; 2d Epistle, verses 5, 6. In short, it is used to express the beginning of persons and things in a variety of ways. See Rev. i. 8; iii. 14; xxi. 6, and xxii. 13; Mark i. 1; Philip iv. 15; Heb. ii. 3; Luke i. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Acts xi. 15; Heb. vii. 3; Acts xxvi. 5; Matth. xxiv. 8; Mark xiii. 8; Heb. iii. 14; Col. i. 18. In the following places it refers to the beginning of the world: Heb. i. 10; Matth. xix. 4, 8, and xxiv. 21; Mark x. 6; 2 Peter iii. 4. But let the reader notice, that in these texts some additional phrase or circumstance is introduced, showing that

the beginning of the world is meant. We are not left to infer this, merely from the term *beginning*. Such are all the places where this word is to be found, except John i. 1, where it is said "in the beginning was the Word." This forms no particular exception to its general usage. See the Unitarian and Trinitarian controversy respecting this text. The only other text which can be deemed an exception, is 1 John iii. 8, which will be considered immediately. But it is not necessary to confine its sense to the beginning of the gospel dispensation, for the very same devil the Jews were of, had been from the beginning of the world; had deceived Eve, and led Cain to murder his brother Abel. The Jews had been "murderous persons" from the beginning of the gospel dispensation. From our Lord's birth to his death they sought to slay him. In verses 37, 40, he accused the Jews of seeking to kill him; and this they did because his *word* had no place in them, verse 37, they abode not in the truth; there was no truth in them. They were of their father the devil. What this was, is explained verse 23. "Ye are from beneath,—ye are of this world." "And whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin," verse 34. And chap. iii. 31, our Lord told them, "he that is of the earth is earthy and speaketh of the earth." What was it then to be from beneath, of this world, and earthy? Was it not to judge after the flesh, or from their earthly corrupt principles and lusts? verse 15. If the Jews had abode in the truth, or Christ's word had been in them, they would not have been murderous persons, or made God's law void through their traditions. Had they believed Moses, they would have believed in Jesus, for he wrote of him. John v. 45—47. Perhaps it will be said—Are not the Jews expressly distinguished from the devil, who is called

their father? Son and father must, in this case, be the same. Professor Stuart informs us above, and I think correctly, that "*son of a murderer*" is simply a Hebrew idiom for "*a murderous person.*" The Jews were so, and they spoke a lie and were the fathers of it. What lie did they speak? They said, verses 39, 40. "Abraham is our father." They lied; for, says our Lord to them—"if ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham." He adds, verse 41, "ye do the deeds of your father." What father? What they had seen or learned from their own evil lusts and passions; and this accords with the source from which all evil proceeds, stated by James, chap. i. 14, 15.

We have seen that the principle of evil was not only personified but deified. In this passage, and others, it is spoken of as a person or being. Eve's lust said to her, "ye shall not surely die," which was a lie. It is in the passage before us represented as the father of lies, and the lusts or desires of this father the Jews did. Lust from the beginning abode not in the truth, for it was by lust conceiving contrary to the commandment, the first deviation from truth was made, and the first lie told; and when lust said "ye shall not surely die," it was not only a liar, but the father of it. From our mother Eve to the present day, all men who listen to the lies of their own lusts, contrary to God's commandments, have found that the ways of transgressors are hard. Men obeying the voice of their lusts, murder themselves, are led to murder others, and have turned the world into a Golgotha.—But while lust is the true cause of all the mischief, an

imaginary being has been invented and believed in, to bear the blame of it.

In concluding these remarks I would ask every candid man, did our Lord mean to tell the Jews that they were of their father, a fallen angel, and that the lusts of this fallen angel they would do? And did he mean that this fallen angel was a murderer from the beginning? That this wicked being abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him? And that "when he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it?" Yes, all this is confidently asserted to be our Lord's meaning. But why should it be believed, until it is first proved, that an angel fell from heaven and became a devil? The belief of this is premature, until it is shown that such a being really exists. To say he was a murderer from the beginning of the world, and refer to Gen. iii., will not do, for we have seen that the serpent that deceived Eve was not a fallen angel; nor is such a being once mentioned in the Old Testament. Nor will it answer any better to refer to Cain's murder of Abel, for not a single hint is dropped, that the devil or a fallen angel had any concern with it. Besides, when the Scriptures trace crimes to their source in plain language, they never refer them to the devil, but to lust within men, see James iv. 1—16, and i. 13—16, Matth xv. 18—21.

1 John iii. 8, 9, 10. "He that committeth sin, is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God, neither he that loveth not

his brother." This, and the preceding passage, were written by the same person. The language and sentiment of both are similar, and the quotations and remarks made are applicable to both. We shall add some brief remarks here. John says, "*he that committeth sin is of the devil.*" He was writing to Christians, who were the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and could not say to them, as he did to the unbelieving Jews, "ye are of your father the devil."—It appears from verse 7, that he said this to guard them against sin. Comp. John viii. 34 and Rom. vi. 10—23. "*For the devil sinneth from the beginning.*" This corresponds to John viii. 44. "*He was a murderer from the beginning.*" What devil sinned or was a murderer from the beginning? Answer; at verse 15, it is said—"whosoever *hateth* his brother is a murderer," and at verse 12, "not as Cain who was of that wicked one and slew his brother." Cain, like the Jews, was of his father the devil, and the lusts of his father he did. But no man will assert that Moses intimates a fallen angel influenced Cain to slay Abel. If he that *hateth* his brother is a murderer, Cain was one before he slew Abel. It was from this *hatred* in his heart the bloody deed proceeded, and which, in the eye of both God and man, constitutes murder.—Well, the very first time *satan* is mentioned in Scripture, the term is applied to a well, and the explanation given us in the margin, is *hatred*. See Sect. iii. Besides, in Sect. ii, it has been shown, that Eve's lust or desire, when it had conceived, brought forth sin: and this devil sinned from the beginning. It came to be personified, yea, was deified, as we have seen in Sections iii., iv, is called satan in the book of Job, and devil and satan in other parts of Scripture. This view is agreeable to the passage, for it is said—"he

that committeth sin is of the devil." It is added, "*for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.*" What then were the works of the devil?

1st. All agree that sin is the work of the devil.—What then produces sin? James says, chap. i. 15, "then, lust when it hath conceived bringeth forth sin." Is it not plain that lust is the devil? Compare Mark vii. 21, 22.

2d. Death is also the work of the devil. Death entered by sin, and sin entered by lust conceiving and bringing it forth; and when sin is finished it bringeth forth death. The wages of sin is death, see Rom. v. 12, and vi. 23.

Was the Son of God manifested then to destroy sin? This is expressly declared, verse 5.—"And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." We think, that, "to take away our sins," in this verse, is the same as to destroy the works of the devil in the passage before us; and in both Christ is said to be manifested to do this. Yea, through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil. See on Heb. ii. 14, below. Does the Son of God by his manifestation destroy death?—Nothing can be more explicitly stated than this. "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O! death, I will be thy plagues; O! grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes." Hos. xiii. 14. See 1 Cor. xv. 53—58. At verse 26, it is expressly declared, "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Suffer me now to ask—Is it any where said Christ was manifested to destroy a fallen angel? This I think no man will affirm. Why then is it so confidently affirmed that the devil is a fallen angel?

Heb. ii. 14, 15. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them, who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Supposing we admit for a moment the existence of such a being as the devil, what follows from this passage? It follows, that he is to be destroyed, for it is expressly said, Christ died, that "through death he might *destroy* him that had the power of death, *that is the devil.*" But, do our orthodox friends allow, that he is to be destroyed through the death of Jesus Christ? No, they aver, that he is to exist forever, the enemy of God and the tormentor of men. But if this text teaches his existence, it as certainly teaches his destruction. I urge then the belief of both, or the rejection of both doctrines. But this is not all, for if this text teaches the devil to be a fallen angel, it as explicitly declares that he has *the power of death.*— By the power of death, is generally understood, power to produce death, and retain men in this state when dead. But is it not a very extraordinary supposition, that such a wicked being should have such a power? Besides, is it not contrary to other parts of Scripture, where God says, "I kill and I make alive; I bring down to the grave and also bring up again." Can any one think God has delegated this power to the devil? By taking into view other parts of Scripture we find death ascribed to a very different cause than the power of a fallen angel. Rom. v. 12, and in chap. vi. 23, we are told that the wages of sin is death, but not a word is said as if the devil had any concern with it. James, chap i. 15, also says, that when "sin is finished it bringeth forth death," but says not a word

about the devil having any power to produce it, or continue it. Nor does the apostle say the sting of death is the devil, but the sting of death is sin. Besides, when speaking of the victory obtained by Jesus Christ over death, the apostle does not say—"O! devil, where is thy power over death," but says, "O! death, where is thy sting, O! grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." The apostle here renders thanks to God for victory over sin, and the law which is the strength of sin, and also over death, but renders no thanks to God through Jesus Christ for victory over a fallen angel or the devil. Can any candid man then think, that if such a being had power over death, that Paul, in giving thanks to God, would have omitted thanking him for victory over this malignant, wicked being, who had so long and universally exercised it? We should rather think, had Paul believed this, victory over the devil would have been one of the principal things he would have mentioned.

What then, it may be asked, is the devil referred to in this passage? I answer, whatever has the power of death. What then has the power of death? I answer, sin and the law the strength of sin, by which death came first to be introduced, and by which it hath passed through to all the human race. See Rom. v. 12, 13. The judgment, Gen. iii. 19, was by one to condemnation. Death reigned by one man's offence, and no power of man has been able to resist his universal sway; and but for the death of Christ, and his resurrection from the dead, no hope of a resurrection could ever be entertained.

But let us examine the passage itself a little more

particularly. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." Well, for what purpose did he take part in flesh and blood? "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." We have shown, on 1 John iii. 8, what the *works* of the devil are, and that Christ was manifested to destroy them. But here Christ is said to *destroy the devil himself.* What devil was it then which produced such works? Such is the workmanship, but what devil was the workman? James tells us in plain words—"then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." Christ by his death would accomplish very little to the purpose, to destroy a fallen angel, or even to destroy sin and death, if lust which bringeth forth sin was not destroyed. It would only be like lopping off the branches from a poisonous tree, while the stock from which they all sprung, was allowed to remain. But Christ, by his death, is not only to destroy sin and death, the works of the devil, but *lust*, or *the devil.* He is not only to destroy the workmanship but the workman, not merely the branches but the root, not only the streams of sin and death, but the fountain from which they have flowed. He is to destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil. See Col. i. 20; Eph. i. 10; 1 Cor. xv. But it ought further to be noticed, that, "*the strength of sin is the law.*" It is this which makes sin to be what it is, for sin is the transgression of the law, and where there is no law there is no transgression. The law has always said—"the soul that sinneth shall die."—The law of Moses entered that the offence might abound. It gendered to bondage, and was the ministration of death. 2 Cor. iii. 7. Comp. Rom. v. 20,

21 ; Gal. iv. 24. It could not give life, but cursed every one who did not continue in all things written in the book of the law to do them. Gal. iii. 21, 10. Well, did Christ through death abolish the law ? The word which is in this passage rendered *destroy*, Parkhurst says, means, "to render ineffectual, abolish, annul, destroy." It is the same word which in 2 Cor. iii. 7, is rendered *done away*, and applied to the law of Moses, which was done away in Christ: and is rendered *abolished*, Eph. ii. 15, when speaking of this very law. It is also rendered abolished, 2 Tim. i. 10, where it is said of Christ, "who hath *abolished* death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." This then is agreeable to the fact.—Christ, through death, destroyed or abolished the law, which was the strength of sin, and denounced death on the transgressor. It had the power of death, and might with as much propriety be called the devil or accuser as the writing, Ezra iv. 6, was called a satan or adversary to the Jews. The law is expressly said to have been the *accuser* of the Jews, John v. 45—47.

But it is added—"and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." The Jews were kept in bondage under the law. But Christ delivers from this bondage, Rom. viii. 15 ; v. 1 ; viii. 1 ; and viii. 14. Whoever believes in Christ, is delivered not only from the law which is the strength of sin, but is led to crucify his flesh with its affections and lusts. And he is delivered from the fear of death, by the knowledge of life and immortality brought to light by the gospel. Indeed, the ultimate end of the death of Christ, is to bring men to a state of incorruption and glory. See 1 Cor. xv.

Acts xiii. 10. "O ! full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all right

eousness; wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" The quotation from Professor Stuart, on John viii. 44 above, equally illustrates this passage. The term devil signifies a *slanderer*. Child of a slanderer, according to Mr. Stuart, signifies "a slanderous person," as son of a murderer, means "a murderous person." In fact, Paul, verse 8, gives for substance this very explanation. "Elymas, the sorcerer withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith." Being full of all subtilty and mischief, he was a satan or devil, in opposing and slandering the faith of Christ.

Matth. xiii. 39. "The enemy that sowed them is the devil." The whole of this context is considered in the Second Part, to which the reader is referred. See Mr. Stuart's remarks quoted above on John viii. 44. The question then is, did a fallen angel mix those wicked children with the children of the kingdom? This must be affirmed, by those who say that the devil is a fallen angel. But though this is asserted, we have never seen any proof of it, nor will it be easily explained, how such a being could do this. Besides, we do not perceive what need there was for the services of such a being to produce such a crop. What then is meant by the devil that sowed the tares? In the Second Part we have shown, that the tares were the unbelieving Jews, who at the end of the world or age were destroyed.—Well, what devil sowed them? The same devil or satan who put it into the heart of Judas to betray Jesus. No other devil was required to produce a crop of tares or wicked men, but the evil principles of their own hearts, for they were of their father the devil and the lusts of their father they did. See on John viii. 44, above.

Matth. xxv. 41. "Then shall he say also unto them

on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."—This passage must be noticed in the Second Part, in considering Matth. chaps. xxiv. 25. Here I shall only notice the following things. 1st. It has been proved, we think beyond all controversy, that the unbelieving, persecuting Jews are repeatedly called the devil and satan. 2d. It has also been proved, that the angels or messengers of this satan, were the false teachers, or those who joined with the persecuting Jews in opposing the gospel and persecuting those who preached it. See on 2 Cor. xi. 14 and xii. 7, in Section v. See also the next Section. As this will not be disputed, let us, 3d. Notice the everlasting fire which is here said to be prepared for the devil and his angels. This everlasting fire, is not said to have been prepared for those whom our Lord is represented as addressing thus—"depart from me ye cursed." No; it is said to have been prepared for the persecuting Jews and their angels or messengers. What then was this everlasting fire? In my Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, chap. ii. Sect. iii. the following things have been shown at length, to which I refer the reader. It has been shown, that *fire* is a figure used in Scripture to express the temporal judgments of God which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple; that punishment which they have been suffering for nearly two thousand years, and are still enduring. It has also been shown, that the phrase "everlasting fire," is used as an equivalent expression for "hell fire." All these, and other things connected with this subject, have been shown there, and need not be repeated here. See on this also 2 Thess. chap. i. considered in the Second Part of this work. 4th. To whom did our Lord refer when he said, "depart from

me ye cursed" into everlasting fire? The answer to this question will be given in considering Matth. chaps. xxiv. xxv. in the Second Part, referred to, which to avoid repetition we shall omit here.

Acts x. 38. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him." Our Lord healed those who were possessed with *demons*, and cast them out: but it is no where said that he cast out *diaboloi*, *devils;* and this is the only place where he is said to have *healed* those who were *oppressed of the devil.* In curing persons he often commanded the demons to depart from them, yet on no occasion does he ever speak to *diabolos*, the devil, and command him to depart.—His temptation in the wilderness may be thought an exception to this remark, which will be considered in its place. If the devil, a fallen angel, inflicted bodily diseases in those days, we can see no good reason why he should not in these, for few think his power is contracted or his malice abated by the lapse of seventeen centuries. But who in our day ascribes diseases to the devil? If it is done, it is merely in compliance with a popular mode of speaking. The question will then be asked—what devil were those persons oppressed with, for it is said our Lord healed all who were oppressed of the devil? In answer to this, let it be observed, that Peter is here evidently speaking of our Lord's kindness in healing men of diseases generally, whatever they were. They are spoken of in the aggregate, and are called being "*oppressed of the devil.*" This is in perfect agreement with what has been stated Sections iii. and iv. that satan, the devil, or Ahraman, was the author of all evil, just as much as the good god Yazdan, was the author of all good. That the Jews

had imbibed such an opinion, and used language in accordance with it, has been shown. Ascribing all diseases here to the oppression of the devil, shows that Peter spoke in accordance with this popular opinion. This our Lord did, in saying, that satan had bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity. Satan is also said to have afflicted Job, but it has been shown, that this very account is introduced, for the purpose of refuting such an opinion, and establishing that God is the author of afflictions as well as of prosperity.

Eph. iv. 27. "Neither give place to the devil." In the preceding verse, the apostle exhorts—"be ye angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath." He immediately adds—"neither give place to the devil." What devil? Evidently *wrath;* for by letting the sun go down upon their wrath, they gave place to this devil; or, it gave occasion to the enemies of the gospel to speak reproachfully. It is not easy to understand how by anger they gave place to a fallen angel. Besides, men's wrathful passions are ascribed to themselves in Scripture. See James iv. 1—6.

Eph. vi. 11. "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." See the whole context. See also all the other texts where the enemies of Christianity are called the devil and satan. What in this verse is called collectively the devil, is thus particularised, verse 12. "*For we wrestle not against flesh and blood,*" or, we wrestle not *merely* with men. For this sense of the phrase *flesh and blood*, see the following among other texts, Matth. xvi. 17, 1 Cor. xv. 50, Gal. i. 16, Heb. ii. 14. "*But against principalities,*" or supreme governors. For this sense of the word *principalities,* see Rom. viii. 38, Tit. iii. 1. "*Against powers,*" or, against magistrates clothed with authority. See for this sense of the word

powers, Rom. xiii. 1—3. It seems to include supreme rulers both civil and ecclesiastical. See Luke xii. 11, Col. i. 16, Eph. i. 21, Col. ii. 10, Luke xx. 20. "*Against the rulers of the darkness of this world.*" Wakefield renders the passage thus—"Clothe yourselves in the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the devices of the accuser. For we not *only* have to wrestle against flesh and blood, but against authority, against the powers, against the rulers, of this dark age; against the wickedness of spiritual men in a heavenly dispensation." In his note he says, "*viz.* against *Jewish governors*, who have a dispensation of religion from heaven, as well as against *heathen magistrates*, under the *darkness* of superstition and idolatry." By the *rulers of the darkness of this world*, Dodridge understands the "*heathen rulers;* and by *flesh and blood* the lower ranks of mankind." These remarks are a sufficient illustration of this passage. If it is asked—What *darkness* did the apostle refer to? I answer, the ignorance, superstition, and wickedness which abounded both among the Jews and Gentiles. Comp. Luke xxii. 53, Col. i. 13. It is well known, that principalities and powers, both civil and ecclesiastical, Jewish and heathen, were opposed to the gospel. They were the rulers of this darkness, and the people were often excited against Christianity by the prevailing ignorance and popular superstitions. See Acts xix. For the Scripture usage of the words *spiritual* and *high* or *heavenly places*, compare Rom. xv. 27, 1 Cor. ix. 11, 1 Peter ii. 5, Col. iii. 16, John iii. 12, Eph. i. 20 and iii. 10. A phrase, the reverse of the entire expression, "*spiritual wickedness in high places*," occurs Eph. i. 3, and assists in explaining it. But, let any one go over this passage, and see if he can give any thing like a rational interpretation of it, on the

supposition that the devil referred to was a fallen angel?

1 Tim. iii. 6, 7. "Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil." What devil does the apostle refer to? In answer to this let us hear the following writers.—Wakefield renders the passage thus—"No novice; lest he be puffed up, and so fall into flame from the accuser. He ought also to have good testimony from without; lest he fall into reproach, and a snare of the accuser." See a similar rendering in the Improved Version.—M'Knight, on this passage, says—"According to Erasmus, this clause should be translated, '*fall into the condemnation of the accuser*.' A sense which the word *diabolos* hath, verse 11. For he supposes that by the accuser is meant, the persecuting Jews and Gentiles, who were ready to condemn the Christians for every misdemeanor." See remarks on the next passage.

2 Tim. ii. 24, 25, 26. "And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient. In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God, peradventure, will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the truth: and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." The principal question to be considered here is—What is the snare of the devil? In the preceding text, some were in danger of falling into it, and here we read of some being in it, and needing to be recovered out of it. They are described as persons who have not repented, who have not acknowledged the truth, but are opposing themselves to it. The servant of the Lord, in attempting their recovery, must not strive, but be gentle unto

all men. He must be apt to teach; he must be patient; and in meekness he must instruct those in the snare of the devil, or those who oppose themselves, who have not repented and acknowledged the truth. It should seem then, that both from the situation of those persons, and also the way in which they are delivered, the snare of the devil is their opposition to the gospel, and the various ways and means by which its enemies prevented men from believing it. M'Knight says—"The snare of the devil, out of which the opposers of the gospel are to be taken alive by the servant of the Lord, signifies those prejudices, and errors, and habits of sensuality, which hindered both Jews and Gentiles in the first age from attending to the evidences of the gospel." In this view the snare of the devil is stated, Col. i. 13, Rom. vi. 17, and their recovery out of it, Acts xxvi. 18, and many other similar passages.

James iv. 7. "Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil and he will flee from you." The preceding verses point out this devil to be envy and pride, or their evil lusts and passions. Comp. chap. iii. 15, 16 and i. 13. That men's lusts and passions are called the devil and satan in other passages has been shown. Instead of indulging these, we are called to resist them. Comp. verse 8. It is easily understood how we can resist such a devil as this; but we have no clear ideas on the subject, to understand it of an invisible, fallen angel. The terms devil and satan, being used to designate men's evil lusts and passions, appear to be the foundation of all the other senses in which those terms are used in Scripture. It was Judas' evil lusts, which made him a devil, and on this account these terms are used to designate the enemies of the gospel. In short, it is such evil lusts and passions, which make men *satans* or *devils*. Accordingly, it is difficult to decide in

some texts, to which these terms are applied. Nor is it of importance to decide; hence, in some texts, we have given both views as agreeable to the Scripture usage of these terms.

Jude 9. "Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil (he disputed about the body of Moses) durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee." Whitby, in his preface to Jude, quoting from Dr. Lightfoot, says. "In citing the story of Michael, the archangel, contending with the devil about the body of Moses, verse 9, he doth but the same that Paul doth, in naming Jannes and Jambres, 2 Tim. iii. 8, namely, allege a story which was current, and owned among that nation, though there was no such thing in Scripture; and so he argueth with them, from their own authors and concessions: for among the Talmudists, there seems to be something like the relics of such a matter, *viz.* of Michael and the angel of death, disputing, or discoursing, about fetching away the soul of Moses." Jude here, then, reasons with the persons he addresses, on a received story among them, for the purpose of refuting their wicked conduct in speaking evil of dignities. In this, he acted as our Lord did, in reasoning on the popular opinion, that satan had bound a woman eighteen years, for the purpose of refuting his adversaries. But the truth of this story is no more admitted in the one case, than the correctness of the opinion is in the other. Both are introduced merely for the sake of argument, without any regard to their truth or falsehood. This story about Michael and the devil must have been invented about the time of the Babylonish captivity or soon after it. Before the captivity we never read of angels having names. Nor before the captivity, does it appear, that the Jews knew any thing about a fallen

called the devil and satan. Besides, the words which Michael used in dispute with the devil, "the Lord rebuke thee," are taken from Zachariah iii. 2, and it is well known that Zachariah prophesied during the captivity. See on this passage Sect. iii. The following quotation from Jahn, not only shows us, that similar opinions to that in the passage before us existed among the Jews, but when and how they came to adopt them. He says, pages 235—6: "The more recent Hebrews, adhering too strictly to the letter of their Scriptures, exercised their ingenuity, and put in requisition their faith, to furnish the monarch Death with a subordinate agent or angel, *viz.* the prince of bad spirits, *ho diabolos*, otherwise called Sammael, and also Ashmedai, and known in the New Testament by the phrases, *the prince of this world, the tempter, who hath the power of death.* The Hebrews, accordingly in enumerating the attributes and offices of the prime minister of the terrific king of Hades, represent him as in the habit of making his appearance in the presence of God, and demanding at the hand of the Divinity the extinction, in any given instance, of human life. Having obtained permission to that effect, he does not fail of making a prompt exhibition of himself to the sick; he then gives them drops of poison, which they drink and die. Comp. John xiv. 30, Hebrews ii. 14. Hence originate the phrases, "*to taste of death*," and "*to drink the cup of death*," which are found also among the Syrians, Arabians, and Persians, Matthew xvi. 28, Mark ix. 1, Luke ix. 27, John viii. 52, Hebrews ii. 9." It appears from this quotation, that "*the more recent Hebrews*," furnished death with an angel, the prince of bad spirits. But the ancient Hebrews knew nothing about such a being; and where could "the more recent Hebrews" imbibe such opinions but during

their captivity, and from their intercourse with the heathen? See Section iv. Jahn allows, that "adhering too strictly to the letter of their Scriptures," they "exercised their ingenuity" to get their Scriptures to favor such opinions. Christians have imbibed the Jewish opinions, and have exercised like ingenuity to find proof for them in the New Testament.

Rev. ii. 10. "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days; be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." It will not be questioned, that what John calls satan, verses 9, 13, 24, and chap. iii. 9, he here calls the devil. See remarks on all these passages, Section v., which are here sufficient for an illustration. Suffer me to ask, does any one believe that the devil, a fallen angel, ever cast Christians into prison? No; but the adversaries of Christianity, then and since, have often done this. It will not answer to say, the devil, a fallen angel, influenced the enemies of the gospel to cast Christians into prison, for this is just taking for granted the point in question. But, are our orthodox brethren aware, that their faith in the devil influencing men to sin, militates against the doctrine of total depravity? What need is there of such a being's assistance? Total depravity is sufficient without him to produce all manner of wickedness. If men would be less wicked, without the devil's influence, then they are not so bad but he can make them worse: and who can tell but they might all be very good if he would only let them alone? Mankind are wicked enough, but all their wickedness arises from a different source. "From whence come wars and fightings? Come they not

hence of your lusts which war in your members?" Is the assistance of a fallen angel required to produce them? But the reader may pursue these reflections at his leisure.

SECTION VII.

ALL THE PASSAGES CONSIDERED, IN WHICH THE TERMS DEVIL AND SATAN ARE USED SYNONYMOUSLY.

The first passages which present themselves for our consideration are Matth. iv. 1—12; Mark i. 12, 13, and Luke iv. 1—14, containing an account of our Lord's temptation. The reader will please turn to them and read them. Most religious people interpret this account literally. But concerning a literal interpretation, Essenus thus writes, pp. 117—120. "The history of our Lord's temptation is commonly understood in a literal sense. Satan is supposed to be a real being; to have actually appeared and conversed with our Saviour. Having taken him up through the air to the top of the temple, and thence to some high mountain, he tempted him in the manner represented in the narrative. This interpretation is loaded not only with difficulties, but even with absurdities shocking to common sense. The learned Mr. Farmer has examined the question; and his objections to the literal translation are so numerous and decisive, that no thinking person can accede to it, without abandoning the first and most obvious principle of reason, and the tenor of the gospel. 'Why the devil at all assaulted our Lord, and what advantage he could possibly gain

over him, has, he observes, always been acknowledged to be a great difficulty, by the advocates of the common interpretation.' But this difficulty is increased by the *manner* the devil proposed his temptation to our Lord. For he came to him in person, and urges temptations such as could proceed only from an evil being. Now with what prospect of success could he tempt our Lord, if he thus exposed himself to open view? By a personal and undisguised appearance, he can never hope to prevail over the feeblest virtues, much less could he expect the illustrious person, whom he knew to be the Son of God, and who knew him to be the devil, to comply with his temptations.

"In the first temptation, in which Jesus is solicited to turn stones into bread, nothing is promised on the part of satan to gain his consent; the request of an implacable enemy, when no advantage attends it, being in itself a reason for rejecting it. But satan defeats his own temptation by asking an useless favor.

"While the foe betrays great folly in the first temptation, he supposes Christ to be actuated by still greater in the second. The people, on seeing Jesus throwing himself from the top of the temple, might conclude that he was the Son of God. But he knew that the tempter had it in his power to lead them to draw the same conclusion of himself. Satan also would throw himself down unhurt; and his miraculous preservation would prove him, as well as Jesus, to be the Son of God. Nay, he might claim the superiority; for it was a greater exertion of power to convey him from the wilderness to the top of the temple, than in sustaining his fall to the court below. What inducement, then, could Christ have for a compliance with the proposal suggested? Would he be disposed to gratify satan, by doing an act at his mere suggestion? Was he to

acquire any glory, or advantage to himself? No; on the contrary, he would only have incurred the infamy of having entered the lists with the devil, without having acquired any superiority over him.

"With regard to the third temptation, the Son of God knew that the father of lies had not the empire of the world at his disposal, and that he therefore promised what he had not power to perform. Such a promise was rather an insult than a temptation, and was calculated only to provoke scorn or resentment. Could the devil then hope by such contemptuous treatment, to engage the Son of God to listen to his accursed counsels; and to seduce him to an act of the highest dishonor to his heavenly Father, that of paying divine homage to this infernal spirit? This interpretation represents the old serpent as acting quite out of character, and supposes him to be as void of policy as he is of goodness; inasmuch as he used the least art in proposing temptations, where the greatest would have been insufficient to insure success.

"The common opinion further ascribes to satan the greatest miracles. It supposes that the devil, by nature a spiritual and invisible agent, has a power of assuming at pleasure a corporeal or invisible form, and of speaking with an audible voice; though there is no more ground from experience, (our sole instructor in the established law of nature,) to ascribe this power to the devil, than to ascribe life to the inanimate, or speech to the brute creation.

"It is a still greater objection to the common opinion, that it ascribes to the devil the performance of things, not only preternatural, but absurb and impossible. Such we must reckon, his showing Christ all the kingdoms of the world from an exceedingly high mountain; for the earth being a spheroidical figure, what

single mountain can command a view of all the parts of it, or those in particular which are opposite to each other? The sun itself, at its immense height above the loftiest mountains of our globe, commands and enlightens, at once, only a single hemisphere. Could the devil, then, from one point of view, show Christ not only the entire circumference of the globe, but also whatever constitutes the glory and grandeur of its kingdoms; and show him such infinitely numerous objects, in situations so distant and so opposite, not gradually and successively, but in one and the same instant of time? This does not seem so properly a miracle, as an absurdity and contradiction."

The question will now be asked—If our Lord was not literally tempted of the devil, a fallen angel, how is this account to be understood? Before directly answering this question, we shall make some general remarks on it, in connexion with its context. The following things then appear obvious:—It is evident, that our Lord's temptation took place immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, and just before he entered on his public ministry. His temptation was passing trial for the work given him to do, and in which he was about to engage. Again; it is equally obvious, that the tempter did not lead our Lord out into the wilderness for the purpose of tempting him, but on the contrary, he was led out there by the Spirit of God, to be tempted of the devil. See Matth. iii. 16; iv. 1, and Luke iv. 1, compared with verse 14. Again; all will allow, that "devil, satan," and "the tempter," are used as synonymous terms. Nor is it less apparent, that our Lord's temptation is related by all the three historians, without any suspicion on their part that it was to be misunderstood.—They use the terms devil, wilderness, satan, Spirit of

God, and tempter, as what would be alike easily understood by their readers. But again; it is taken for granted in this account, and is plain from many other parts of Scripture, that our Lord was susceptible of temptation. To deny this, is to say Jesus was not a partaker in flesh and blood with the children, Heb. ii. 14, that he was not tempted, for without such things we may as well speak of tempting a tree or a stone. But he suffered being tempted, and is able to succour them that are tempted, Heb. ii. 15. He was hungry, and thirsty, and weary, as we are: he was sorrowful, and joyful, felt pain and enjoyed ease. In short, he was pleased and angry, Mark iii. 5, was grateful for kindness, and felt an insult, as could be shown, if it were necessary. Many good people seem to forget, that sin does not consist in having such appetites and passions, but in their indulgence in a way and to an extent, which God has prohibited. They only render their possessor susceptible of sinning. Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.—Heb. iv. 16. I may just add, that the tempter here mentioned, like the tempter which deceived Eve, professed to be our Lord's friend, and that listening to the proposals made would be for his advantage. This is apparent from comparing the two accounts. With these general remarks in view, let us attend to the

1st. Temptation of our Lord. "And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungered. And when the tempter came to him, he said, if thou art the Son of God command that these stones be made bread." To fast, in Scripture language, does not always mean total abstinence from food during the period persons are said to fast, but using a less quantity, and coarser kind of food. See the book of Daniel, and other passages. When it is

said, Luke iv. 2, that our Lord "*did eat nothing*" during forty days, seems, from comparing Acts xxvii. 33, to mean nothing more than that he had no regular meals. Without a miracle, he could not have lived forty days entirely without food, and no miracle is supposed to have been wrought to sustain him. Nor is it easily perceived, why it would have been sin to turn stones to bread, yet no sin to work a miracle to support nature without food. Our Lord might have been said to have fasted forty days, by eating only of such food as was furnished him by the fields. It is evident that his fasting gave rise to the first temptation. What tempter came to him? What other but his *hunger?* No other tempter in this case was necessary. Unless our Lord was sustained by a miracle, he must have felt the sensations of hunger before they were ended, but it was not until then that his appetite became clamorous for food, and tempted him, by suggesting "*command that these stones be made bread.*" What said this? Was it not the craving of his bodily appetite for food? It suggested a miracle to be wrought. It has suggested to many since, to steal to satisfy its cravings, and God, who remembers that we are dust, has sometimes interposed by miracle to satisfy it. Even "men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry." Prov. vi. 30. Comp. verse 31. There are some points of similarity, and dissimilarity, between Eve's temptation and that of our Lord's, which deserve to be noticed. For example; bodily appetite was the tempter in both cases, and in both a dialogue between them and their appetite is represented as having taken place. But notice, when Eve lusted after the fruit, she had all the other trees from which to supply her necessities. Her appetite did not become a tempter to her from want,

but took occasion from the restraint which God had laid on it, in prohibiting the use of one tree of the garden. She listened to the voice of her appetite and sinned. But our Lord's appetite became a tempter to him from want of food, and attempted to seduce him to work a miracle for a supply. But he repelled the temptation by saying, verse 4, "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." It was no sin in Eve or our Lord to have the appetite, or to gratify it. It became sin in Eve to gratify her appetite from that which God had prohibited. It would have been sin in Jesus, to have wrought a miracle to gratify his appetite, for his divine power was not given him for this purpose, but to establish his mission as the Saviour of the World. To have complied with the temptation would have shown his want of trust in God, and been an improper exercise of his power for his own personal gratification. To say that our Lord was hungry, yet felt no inclination to enjoy food, is in other words telling us that he was not hungry, and denying that this was any temptation. But feeling all the painful sensations of hunger, and having power to turn stones to bread, yet resisting the suggestion, could only be done by him who was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, or evil desire.

2d. Our Lord's second temptation is related verse 5—8. "Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, if thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, he shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." What tempter now assailed our Lord? In order to answer this question several things must be

noticed. The scene of this temptation is not laid in the wilderness, but in Jerusalem, and at the temple, where all the tribes of Israel assembled to worship.—Further, the Jews at that time were not only in high expectation of Messiah's appearance, but they expected him to come in a miraculous way for their deliverance and glory. The scene is laid at the place suited to the nature of the temptation. On the other hand, our Lord was just about to enter on the work given him to do. Unless we say that he was ignorant and stoical, we must allow him to feel sensibly, in view of the sufferings which awaited him. In fact, if we admit that he foresaw what afterwards took place, and was not deeply affected by the prospect, yea, wished if possible to avoid it, we must believe him destitute of the common feelings and sinless frailties of our nature. If after he had learned obedience by the things which he suffered, he said, "Father let this cup pass from me," can any man think, that nature would not say the same, yea, suggest some mode of escaping them, when he surveyed the whole scene of suffering at the commencement? To deny this, is to deny that our Lord was a man, and a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. Yea, to deny that our Lord possessed the fine feelings and tender sensibilities which so conspicuously shown in him. It is in fact saying, our Lord was totally unconcerned about the success of his future ministry among the Jews, that he had no desire that they should receive him as the true Messiah, and that no reflections passed through his mind respecting the best manner in which he might gain the attention and affections of his nation. What then was the tempter? It was *flesh and blood* suggesting the propriety of accommodating himself to the prevailing opinions and expectations of the Jews to secure his success: or, their prevailing ex-

pectations and opinions, presented themselves to his mind, pointed out a course, which, if pursued, he would avoid all opposition from them, and be received as their Messiah. What was this? The Jews expected their Messiah to come from heaven, or in a miraculous manner among them. This is generally admitted. It was suggested, cast thyself down from the pinnacle of the temple among them, while at worship in the court below; seeing you fall from such a stupendous height unhurt, they will immediately receive you as the Messiah, and invest you with all the honors, powers, and emoluments of the Jewish church. If, or rather, since thou art the son of God, there can be no danger, "for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." But our Lord did not listen to flesh and blood, reasoning on the principles of accommodation, but repelled the temptation by saying—"it is written, again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." A compliance with it would have been presumption, a perversion of Scripture in justification of it, and doing evil that good might come. It would have been sacrificing truth at the shrine of prejudice and popular opinion, and shrinking from trials and sufferings through which he must pass, if he would accomplish the end of his mission. It behoved Christ to suffer, Luke xxiv. 46.

3d. The third temptation is stated in verses 8, 9.—"Again the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and saith unto him, all these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." What devil now tempted our Lord? It was certainly that which said to him, if thou wilt fall down and worship me; and which said, Luke iv. 6.

"All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine." Well, allow me to ask, had a fallen angel all these things at his disposal? Could he confer all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them? No man will say so; nor does our Lord call him a liar or deceiver, in promising such things. What then promised, and could confer all these things on our Lord? I answer; in the days of our Lord the power of the Romans had subdued all the then known world. To whomsoever they would they gave its kingdoms and the glory of them. This was done by the force of arms. If our Lord would then make his extraordinary power the means of propagating his kingdom, he might raise himself to the head of the Roman Empire, or become master of the whole world. The tempter was then, the glory and grandeur of the world presented to the Saviour's mind, to excite his ambition to use his power in raising himself to universal empire. But this temptation he repelled by saying—"get thee hence satan (or adversary) for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." It is added, that satan departed from him for a season, which intimates that our Lord was assailed with similar temptations afterwards. But was he ever tempted afterwards by a fallen angel or evil spirit? Nothing of the kind appears, but he was certainly tempted afterwards with like temptations to those I have mentioned. In short, these three temptations are, for substance, all the various temptations with which our Lord was assailed during his ministry. Indeed, they comprise all that is in the world, which prove tempters to mankind. "The lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," 1 John ii. 16. Was not our Lord, during his

ministry, repeatedly hungry, and under temptation to supply his wants by his divine power? Certainly he was, but we find he always resisted such a temptation, and trusted in God for food, in the ordinary course of Providence. Again, was he not under strong temptations to sacrifice truth and duty to the prejudices and opinions of the Jews, in order to his ministry being useful among them? No one will deny this. But, do we ever find him making sinful compliances with them, to induce them to receive him as their Messiah? No, he was deaf to all such temptations and allurements. Again, during his ministry, he had temptations presented to him to raise himself to a throne, yea, to the empire of the world. The people seeing his power, on one occasion would have come by force to make him a king. But, did he encourage them, or avail himself of this, to raise himself to honor and glory? All know, the reverse of this was the case. He was likewise accused of making himself a king, But he repelled the charge by saying his kingdom was not of this world.—All these temptations our Lord encountered during his ministry, but was more than a match for them all. He suffered being tempted, that he might know how to succor them that are tempted, to turn aside from truth and duty in his service by similar allurements. But alas! how many "*Vicars of Bray*" have professed to be his servants, who have counted gain godliness, and sacrificed every thing for the honor, the power, and the wealth of the world.

Such are my views of our Lord's temptation, but my limits forbid entering more minutely into a detail of the evidence whereby they might be supported. It is easily perceived, that these views are in accordance with the meaning of the terms devil and satan, as used in other parts of Scripture, and agree to the tempter

which tempts men every day. But to understand a fallen angel designated by these terms, is not supported by other parts of Scripture, and involves this account in absurdities and utter impossibilities.

Mark iv. 15. "And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when they have heard, satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts." By comparing Luke viii. 12, the devil is said to do this, and in Matth. xiii. 19, it is said to be done by "the wicked one," or rather "the wicked," for *one* is in italic. What satan, devil, or wicked one, then took away the seed of the word sown in men's hearts? It has been shown, that the terms devil and satan, are often used to designate the Jews, the adversaries of our Lord and his doctrine. That they were *wicked* persons no one questions. It is then agreeable to the fact, that as soon as our Lord sowed the good seed of the word they were ready to prevent its salutary effects on the minds of his hearers, by contradicting and blaspheming it. Every scheme was devised by them to excite popular prejudice against our Lord and his doctrine. No assistance from a fallen angel was needed in this case, for we are told such hearers of the word did not *understand* it. What is not understood and believed, is little regarded, soon forgotten, and easily parted with; and especially if public prejudice be against it. If we were even to say, men's evil lusts and passions were the devil and satan that took away the seed of the word from their minds, it would be in agreement with the Scripture usage of these terms. How the seed could be taken away by means of either of these, is easily understood, but how it could be removed by a fallen angel is to me inexplicable.—Let it be remembered that it is no where said that such

a being made use of them as his tools to accomplish this. See quotations from Jahn, above.

Rev. xii. 9. "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." See verses 10, 11, 12, yea, the whole chapter. Again, it is said, Rev. xx. 1, 2, "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and satan, and bound him a thousand years." See the whole chapter. In these two passages, we have John's authority for saying, that the great dragon, old serpent, devil, satan, and accuser of the brethren, all mean the same thing. This thing, or being, is also said to deceive "*the whole world.*" It is from these two passages chiefly, that people conclude that the serpent which deceived Eve was a fallen angel, for here, say they, "the devil and satan is called that *old* serpent, and we know that the devil is a fallen angel." And how do they know all this so clearly and confidently? Their fathers, their catechisms, and their ministers have told them so: and this conclusion is drawn too from a book so highly figurative, that no man has hitherto been able satisfactorily to explain it. Notwithstanding, this is frankly owned by every candid man, yet from this very book the strongest proofs are generally adduced for a personal devil, and eternal punishment. We would respectfully ask our orthodox brethren, why they allow the book of Revelations to be highly figurative or symbolical, yet give a literal interpretation to the above passages concerning the serpent, devil, and satan? We would affectionately press it on their attention, why they interpret the parts of these passages concerning

the devil and satan literally, and yet would refuse to go through with a literal interpretation of them? I shall give a specimen of the absurdities which such a literal interpretation involves. It must then be believed, that the devil has seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns on his heads. And it must be believed, that Michael and his angels, had a battle with the devil and his angels, and that it was fought in heaven. Besides, our orthodox friends ought to inform us, how the devil got back to heaven to fight this battle there, seeing they believed he fell from heaven before he tempted Eve. In short, he has been in heaven and fallen from it a number of times, if such principles of Scripture interpretation are admitted. He fell from heaven before Eve's temptation. He fell again when the Seventy were out preaching. And John in the above chapters informs us that he was cast out of heaven to the earth a third time. And if *Lucifer* be the devil, he has at least had four falls from heaven, for it is said, how art thou fallen from heaven, Lucifer, son of the morning.

Is it then asked, what this great dragon, that old serpent, the devil and satan was? Dr. Newton says, vol. iii. 135—139, speaking of this dragon—"We find the kings and people of Egypt, who were the great persecutors of the primitive church of Israel, distinguished by this title in several places of the Old Testament: Psalm lxxiv. 13; Isai. li. 9; Ezek. xxix. 3, and with as much reason and propriety may the people and emperors of Rome, who were the great persecutors of the primitive church of Christ be called by the same name, as they are actuated by the same principle. For that the Roman Empire was here figured, the characters and attributes of the dragon plainly evince." See the pages referred to.

Such are his remarks on the first of these passages.

On the second he says, "After the destruction of the beast and of the false prophet, there still remains 'the dragon,' who had delegated his power to them, 'that old serpent, which is the devil and satan:' but he is bound by 'an angel,' an especial minister of Providence; and the famous millennium commences, or the reign of the saints upon earth for a thousand years, verse 1—6. 'Binding him with a great chain, casting him into the bottomless pit, shutting him up, and setting a seal upon him,' are strong figures to show the strict and severe restraint which he should be laid under, 'that he might deceive the nations no more,' during the whole period. Wickedness being restrained, the reign of righteousness succeeds, and the administration of justice and judgment is given to the saints of the Most High." p. 205.

He adds, page 215. "At the expiration of the thousand years, verses 7—10, the restraint shall be taken off from wickedness, and for 'a little season' as it was said before, verse 3, 'satan shall be loosed out of his prison,' and make one effort more to re-establish his kingdom. As he deceived our first parents in the paradisaical state, so he shall have the artifice 'to deceive the nations' in this millennial kingdom, to show that no state or condition upon earth is exempted and secured from sinning." I would only add, that it is *lust* or evil desire "*which deceiveth the whole world*," and has been the source of its wars and bloodshed, James iv. 1—4. This is the universal deceiver.

We have now finished our investigation of all the texts in the Bible, where the terms devil and satan are used. Having expressed our own views of the different passages, we leave the candid reader to form his own opinions, and make his own reflections on the subject.

SECTION VIII.

ALL THE TEXTS CONSIDERED, WHERE THE DEVIL IS SUPPOSED TO BE CALLED THE EVIL ONE, THE TEMPTER, THE GREAT DRAGON, THE SERPENT, AND OLD SERPENT, THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD, THE PRINCE OF THE POWER OF THE AIR, AND THE GOD OF THIS WORLD.

THESE names, given to the devil, a supposed fallen angel, will require but a brief consideration, for some of them have been introduced in the preceding sections. Indeed, if *devil* and *satan* designate no such being in the Bible, it will be allowed by most people, that he is not to be found in the Bible. But we shall not take this for granted. The devil is then

1st. Supposed to be called *o' poneros*, the evil one, or, the wicked one. This word is rendered in the common version, evil, wicked, wickedness, harm, &c. The sacred writers use it to express evil or wickedness in a variety of ways. Such as evil or unclean spirits, Matth. xii. 45; Acts xix. 12, 13, 15, 16; Luke vii. 21; viii. 2, and xi. 26. An evil or unclean spirit is the same as an evil or unclean demon, and have no connexion with our present subject. This word is used to express moral evil, Matth. v. 37; 1 Thess. v. 22; 2 Thess. iii. 3; John xvii. 15; Physical evil, Acts xxviii. 21; Rev. xvi. 2; Matth. v. 39. The day of persecution is called the evil day, Eph. vi. 13. The heart of man, from whence all evil proceeds, is called "an evil heart of unbelief," Heb. iii. 12. Out of this source proceed

evil thoughts, Matth. ix. 4; Luke xi. 29; James ii. 4; Matth. xii. 35; Luke vi. 45. Also, wicked and malicious words, 3 John 10; Matth. v. 11; Luke vi. 22. Also, evil works or deeds, Matth. xii. 35; Mark vii. 23; Matth xv. 19; Luke vi. 45; John iii. 19, and vii. 7; James iv. 16; Col. i. 21; 2 John 11; Acts xxviii. 21; Rom. xii. 9; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Luke iii. 19; Matth. vii. 17, 18. Men practising wickedness, are hence called evil, or wicked persons, Matth. xii. 39; xvi. 4; vii. 11, and xii. 34; Luke xi. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 13; Luke vi. 45; 1 Cor. v. 13; Matth. v. 45; xiii. 49, and xxii. 10; Luke vi. 35; Acts xvii. 5; 2 Thess. iii. 2. Such wicked persons have an evil conscience, Heb. x. 22. An evil eye, Matth. vi. 23, and xx. 15; Mark vii. 22; Luke xi. 34. Become evil servants, in various conditions of life, Matth, xviii. 32, and xxv. 26; Luke xix. 22. And as evil or wickedness prevails, the world or age is said to be evil, Gal. i. 4. Such is a brief review of all the places where the word *poneros* occurs, except the following, and are the only passages, where any one can suppose this word designates an evil being or fallen angel.

Matth. vi. 13. "Deliver us from the evil." See also Luke xi. 4, where the same language is used. Some have said, this expression means, "deliver us from the evil *one*," thereby meaning the devil, a fallen angel.—But the word *one* does not occur in the original, is not even in the common version, nor does the scope of the passage require it. Such a mode of establishing this doctrine, does not require a serious refutation. In Matth. xiii. 19, the phrase "*wicked one*" occurs, but the word *one* is in italic, which might be omitted, or the word person, or thing, substituted in its place. But as it has been shown in the last section, that this phrase is synonymous to devil and satan, and has no reference

to a fallen angel, it requires no further notice here.—The same remarks apply to Matth. xiii. 38, which has been sufficiently considered already. The expressions "the tares are the children of the wicked," and "the good seed are the children of the kingdom," are explained by the quotation from professor Stuart on John viii. 44, above. "Children of the wicked one," simply means "wicked children," or, "children of wickedness." The Improved Version, in a note on this passage, says, "sons of the evil one," are wicked men.—Such, in the Old Testament, are called sons of Belial, or worthlessness, i. e. worthless men, 1 Sam. ii. 12; 1 Kings xxi. 10. See 2 Cor. vi. 15. In 1 John ii. 13, 14, the phrase "wicked one," is used twice. The word *one* is not put in italic type, but ought to have been, for there is no reason for this alteration. See also Eph. vi. 16; 1 John iii. 12, and v. 18, 19, where the wicked, or evil one, or thing, is also mentioned. The contexts of these passages show, that the word *thing* might be substituted for the word *one*. Take the last passage for an example. The wicked one or thing, which toucheth or rather hurteth not those who are born of God, is that from which they keep themselves, and this is sin, for it is said, "whosoever is born of God sinneth not," verse 18. This is confirmed from verse 19, for John adds, "we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness, or sin; or, simply evil. See, on all these passages, our remarks on the passages where the devil and satan are mentioned, and which are synonymous terms with evil or wicked one. I shall only add from Wakefield, on Matth. v. 37.—"*The evil one.* So I render again, verse 39, and in other places; as our translators rightly render below. Nearly in the same manner, xiii. 19, and elsewhere, *the wicked one.* Whatever is calculated *to seduce men*

to sin, is represented by the sacred writers under the figure of *a living agent*, called *the evil one—the adversary—the enemy—the devil, and satan.*"

2d. The devil is also supposed to be called "*o peiradzon*, the tempter." This word is rendered to tempt, to try, to prove. The following are all the places where it occurs in the New Testament. James i. 13, 14; Gal. vi. 1; Rev. ii. 10; Acts xv. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 5; Heb. xi. 17; John vi. 6; 1 Thess. iii. 5; Acts v. 9; Rev. iii. 10; 1 Cor. x. 13; Matth. xxii. 18; Mark xii. 15; Luke xx. 23; Heb. ii. 18; Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 2; Matth. xvi. 1, and xix. 3; Mark viii. 11, and x. 2; Luke xi. 16; John viii. 6; Matth. iv. 1, and xxii. 35; Heb. iv. 15. We have given book, chapter and verse, that the reader may consult the passages and see, if in any one of them, the tempter mentioned, refers to such a being. The following are the only places from which such a thing could be supposed.

Matth. iv. 3; Mark i. 13, and Luke iv. 2, 13, have already been noticed in considering our Lord's temptation and require no further attention. If the devil and satan do not refer to a fallen angel, the tempter cannot, for it is allowed these terms are used as names for the same thing. In 1 Thess. iii. 5, it is said, "For this cause when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you and our labor be in vain." What tempter did the apostle refer to? Answer, we have seen from various passages, that the principle of evil, or sensual desire, is the tempter, and is called the devil and satan. Indeed, this is the foundation of the other senses in which these words are used. This principle, operated in every possible way, in the opposers of Christianity, whom Paul calls satan, chap. ii. 18, noticed, sect. v.

the Thessalonians were called to suffer persecution from them, chap. iii. 3, 4. They were also liable to be influenced by the principle of evil or sensual desire.—Anxious for their steadfastness in the faith, the apostle expresses his fear, lest by *some means* the tempter had tempted them, and his labor prove vain. This view is confirmed, from verses 6, 7, where we are informed what relieved the apostle's anxiety of mind. It was not that a fallen angel had not succeeded in tempting them, but merely that their faith and charity continued.

3d. The devil is also supposed to be called—"*the dragon*" and "*the great red dragon,*" Rev. chaps. xii. xiii. xvi. xx. But sufficient has been said on these passages in the last section to which we refer the reader.

4th. The devil is also believed, to be called "the serpent," and "that old serpent." We have noticed Gen. iii. sufficiently in Section ii. Where the phrase, "that old serpent" occurs, has also been considered, Sect. vii. The only other text relative to this subject, is 2 Cor. xi. 3. "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity which is in Christ." See some remarks on this passage, Sect. ii. What I would observe further here is—1st. Had Paul believed, as a great many do now, that a fallen angel or wicked spirit beguiled Eve, would he not have said so? Let any candid man consider, if he would merely say the serpent beguiled her. Is any account given in Scripture of the fall of such an angel from heaven? If there be, we will thank any man to point it out. Paul does not even say, that "*old serpent,*" or "*that old serpent, the devil, and satan.*" This is the more remarkable omission, as in this very chapter he

speaks of satan being transformed into an angel of light. 2d. We allow, yea, contend, that the serpent is the same as the devil and satan, and they are used in Scripture as convertible terms to express the same thing. As to this point, we agree perfectly with our orthodox friends. We only contend, that the devil and satan is not a fallen angel, or evil being, as they suppose. What then is the tempter, the devil, and satan, of which the Scriptures speak? James says, "every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." This is the real original serpent, devil, or tempter, as has been shown on various texts in the course of our remarks. See Sect. ii. particularly. No man could be tempted, unless he had lusts or desires. The Saviour was incapable of being tempted without them. 3d. Eve was beguiled by the serpent, or her desire after what was forbidden, and the apostle was in fear concerning the Corinthians, lest by any means their minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. He does not intimate that he was in fear that a fallen angel would do this. No, his fear was, lest *by any means* this might be done, and in the course of the chapter, he points not to a fallen angel as the agent, but to false teachers who preached another gospel to them, and whom, verse 13, he calls "*false apostles*," and "*deceitful workers*." In Sect. ii. it has been shown that the *serpent* is the symbol of deceit.

5th. The devil is also supposed to be called the prince of this world (*o' arhon*). This word occurs in Luke xii. 58; xxiii. 13; Acts iv. 5; Luke xxiii. 35; xxiv. 20; John vii. 20; Acts iii. 17; iv. 8, 26; xiii. 27; Rom. xiii. 3; Matt. ix. 23; John vii. 48; Acts xiv. 5; vii. 27, 35; xvi. 19; Acts xxiii. 5; Matt. xx. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8; Luke xiv. 1; Matt. ix. 18; Luke viii. 41; xviii. 18; John iii. 1; xii. 42. The word in the

above texts is rendered chief, ruler, magistrate, prince, &c. It is applied to men as rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, and that whether Jewish or heathen. In the following texts, it is rendered prince, and refers to the prince of the demons, or as it is rendered in our version, devils, Matt. ix. 34; xii. 24; Mark iii. 22; Luke xi. 15. Beelzebub was the prince of the demons. But that this heathen god had no reference to satan or the devil, see Dr. Campbell's sixth Dissertation. In Eph. ii. 2, this word occurs, and is rendered prince, which will be considered presently. The only passages, where it is supposed a reference is had to the devil, are the following, which I shall quote altogether, and then submit some remarks on them for consideration.

John xii. 31. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince (*o' arhon*) of this world be cast out." And xiv. 30. "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince (*o' arhon*) of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." And xvi. 8—12, "And when he (the comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of judgment, because the prince (*o' arhon*) of this world is judged." On these passages, the principal question we have to consider is, who, or what did our Lord refer to, by "*the prince of this world?*" Orthodox people say—"*the devil, a fallen angel.*" But that our Lord, by "the prince of this world" meant the then reigning civil and ecclesiastical rulers, I shall now attempt to prove.

1st. This view is in agreement with the general, yea, almost universal usage of the word *arhon* in the New Testament. Let any one turn to all the above texts and he must be convinced of this; for this word is rendered magistrate, ruler, prince, &c., and applied to the rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, then ex-

isting in Judea. It is not once used in reference to a fallen angel unless it is proved from the three texts just quoted.

2d. From the scope and connexion of our Lord's discourse, where he speaks of the prince of this world. The three texts where this is mentioned, all occur in discourses of our Lord, only related by John. They were spoken by our Lord to his disciples in reference to, and in view of, his apprehension, sufferings and death. The context of these passages shows this, which the reader is desired to consult. As to the first, consult verses 27—34, and it will be seen that our Lord was speaking in view of the *hour* of his crucifixion. As to the last two, they occur in that discourse delivered partly in the upper room where he had eaten the last passover, and partly on the road from thence to the garden where he was apprehended. In chap. xiv. 30, he says, "the prince of this world cometh," and at verse 31, he adds—"But that the world may know that I love the father; and as the father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence." Go where? let me ask. Evidently to the garden, where he was apprehended, as is evident by reading on to chap. xviii. 15.

3d. The fact of the case shows, that by "the prince of this world," our Lord referred to the civil and ecclesiastical power, and not to a fallen angel. Let any one consult all the future history of our Lord's life, from the time he uttered these words, until he died on the cross, but he finds nothing that looks like a fallen angel or devil coming to him. Well, did those powers come to him? Nothing can be more certain.—Our Lord had no sooner ended his discourse, in chaps. xiv., xv., xvi., xvii., than we are told, chap. xviii. 1. "When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth

with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into which he entered, and his disciples."—Well, what came to him here? From verse 3, and onward, we are informed, that Jesus was apprehended by the civil authority, urged on by the ecclesiastical. The prince of this world, or as the word is rendered in other places, the ruler or magistrate of this world came. Our Lord, no doubt, knew all that Judas, the chief priests, and civil authorities were engaged in for his apprehension. Well, he says, chap. xiv. 30, "The prince of this world cometh," (*erhatai*). To testify to the world his love to the father, and obedience to his commandment to lay down his life, he says to his disciples, verse 31, "Arise, let us go hence." He proceeds to the garden, where he knew Judas and the officers were coming to apprehend him. He foresaw their coming, and says, "the prince or ruler of this world cometh," and he goes forth volunrily to meet the result. Accordingly in chap. xviii. 3, it is said, "Judas then having received a band of men, and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh (*erhatai*) thither with lanterns, and torches, and weapons." The chapter throughout shows all that took place afterwards, which the reader would do well to consult.

4th. The above is confirmed from the words which follow. He said "the prince of this world cometh," and immediately adds—"and hath nothing in me."—This is generally understood, that the devil, a fallen angel, had nothing of sin or corruption in the Saviour whereon to work. But this interpretation is perfectly gratuitous, for there is no evidence that this was our Lord's meaning. But, on the view which I have given of the prince of this world, it is consonant to truth, and evidence stated in the context. Thus, when

our Lord was taken before Pilate, and he had examined the case, what does Pilate say? His words are remarkable: "I find in him no fault at all," chap. xviii. 38. Very similar to those of our Lord: "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me," or against me.

5th. My view is also confirmed from the words which immediately precede the expression—"the prince of this world cometh." They stand thus—"Hereafter I will not talk much with you." Why not? Our Lord assigns as a reason for his not talking much with his disciples afterwards—"for the prince of this world cometh." Was the devil, a fallen angel, to prevent his talking with his disciples? This must be affirmed by those who say that he referred to such a being. But how could he prevent his talking with his disciples? Let those explain this who believe it. It is easily perceived how he was prevented, on my views. The moment he was apprehended in the garden, his disciples forsook him and fled, and from this period, being in the hands of his enemies, he was not at liberty to talk much with his disciples, nor had he much opportunity if even liberty had been allowed him.

6th. The only thing remaining which deserves notice, is the following. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." The word here rendered judgment, signifies condemned or condemnation, and is so rendered in other places.—Is it asked how the world were condemned? They were so, by their rejecting and crucifying Christ, and is illustrated by such passages as John iii. 18, 19. Is it asked how the prince or powers of this world were cast out? By putting to death the Lord of glory, the Jews filled up the measure of their iniquity, and from

that hour were cast out from being the people of God, and have been so for nearly two thousand years.—They were the chief persons concerned in our Lord's crucifixion, for the Roman power was only called in to effect their purpose. Pilate showed how unwilling he was to condemn Jesus contrary to all law and justice.

6th. The devil is also supposed to be called "the prince of the power of the air." Eph. ii. 2. Wakefield renders the passage thus—"conformably to the ruler of this empire of darkness, the spirit that now showeth its power in the sons of disobedience." "It was the opinion both of the Jews and heathen," says Whitby on this text, "*that the air was full of spirits* called *demons;* that from the earth to the firmament, all things were full of these companies or rulers; and that there was a prince over them who was called *the governor of the world*, that is, of the darkness of it." This agrees to Zoroaster's *angel of darkness*, who was considered the author and director of all evil. The apostle evidently here alludes to this heathen notion, but he told the Ephesians, that this prince or governor of the world, was the spirit which wrought in the children of disobedience. The evil, or wickedness of men's minds, is the true devil, satan, or governor of this world.

7th. The devil is also supposed to be called "the god of this world." 2 Cor. iv. 4. "In whom the god of this world (*aionos*) hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." The god of this world, mentioned here, is the same as the prince or power of the air, in the last, which, Whitby says, they called "*governor of this world*, that is, of the darkness of it." But the

apostle declares that this governor of the world, prince of the power of the air, or god of this world, was the spirit that wrought in the children of disobedience.—This view is agreeable to the words before us, for this certainly blinded the minds of them which believed not.

We have now finished our remarks on all the passages which are supposed to contain the names and titles of an evil being in the universe, an angel who fell from heaven, and deemed by most Christians but little inferior in powers to its Creator. We have stated our views frankly, but in some cases very briefly. Such texts on which the greatest dependence is placed for proof, have been considered pretty fully.—The result of this investigation has been, a deep conviction, that the more the subject is examined, it will be found that the Bible gives no countenance to that evil being Christians call the devil and satan. But of this our readers must judge for themselves.

SECTION IX.

FACTS STATED, SHOWING THAT THE DEVIL IS NOT A FALLEN ANGEL OR REAL BEING.

In the preceding Sections, several facts have been developed, showing that the devil is not a fallen angel. We shall now very briefly advert to some other facts, not easily reconciled to this doctrine.

1st. *No distinct account is given in Scripture of an angel of God sinning in heaven, thereby becoming*

a devil, and on account of which he was cast out of it. When proof is demanded of such things, we are referred to texts where satan or the devil is said to have fallen from heaven, and to be cast out into the earth. But we have shown that the sacred writers attached no such ideas to those passages, and by quotations from Jahn, Newton, and others, that a very different thing was intended. How then is the fact accounted for, that no sacred writer gives such an account? Is it too much to expect, that such a remarkable event would be clearly and repeatedly mentioned, yea, recorded previous to the fall of man? If true, would all the sacred writers have been silent about it both before and after the fall? This is contrary to God's usual conduct with men. When God was about to destroy the world by a flood, and the cities of the plain by fire, he forewarns the people of their danger, so as to avoid the consequences. But concerning a holy angel becoming a devil in heaven, his fall from it, and the direful consequences which resulted to our race, God says nothing about such things. The want of such information is indisputable, and we think no man will affirm, that this is either like God's usual dealings with men, or that he assigns any reason for withholding such information. How then, do our orthodox friends account for all this, and where did they obtain such explicit information as they generally give to people about a fallen angel, and the consequences of his fall upon the human race? Was it from Paradise Lost and the Apocrypha, or was it from the Scriptures? We beg of them to re-examine this subject.

2d. *If it be true that an angel fell from heaven, and has been walking about in the world seeking whom he might devour, for nearly six thousand years, how is*

it to be accounted for, that no sacred writer asserts that any person ever saw him, or had personal intercourse with him? They repeatedly inform us of persons seeing good angels, and relate the conversations which men had with them. They even inform us of their appearance, and sometimes describe their clothing. But do they ever intimate, that any one ever saw the devil, describe his appearance and clothing, or relate any conversations held with him? It cannot be for want of powers on his part to do all this, for our brethren believe that he can do more remarkable things than any of these. Is he ashamed to show himself among men? We doubt this, for he is believed to be a shameless being. Well, does he conceal himself from men, that he may the more effectually accomplish his wicked designs against them? We doubt this, also, for it is affirmed by his advocates, that he can assume a very fascinating form, yea, transform himself into an angel of light, the more effectually to deceive us. How then do our orthodox brethren account for it, that so sacred writer says any one ever saw the devil, or conversed with him? We are aware, that they may object by saying "did he not assume the likeness of a serpent in Eden, and did he not converse with Eve?" But brethren, we have shown, Section ii., that this is a mistaken view of Gen. iii. You will, perhaps, object again by saying, "did not satan make a personal appearance among the sons of God, as stated in the first and second chapters of Job, and is not his conversation distinctly related?"—We answer, yes; but can you disprove the evidence which has been adduced, that satan was not a real being, but only the evil imaginary god of the Magians? If you can, we shall feel greatly indebted to you, if you take the trouble to do this. But perhaps you will

object again, by saying, "did not the devil appear to the Saviour and hold a conversation with him?" Answer: did you ever notice, that neither in the first two chapters of Job, nor in the account of our Lord's temptation, nothing is said about any form, color, or shape, which satan assumed? Nor in either of these cases, are the conversations represented as held by him with sinful men. Besides, in considering those accounts, we think it has been shown that no such being was intended by the writers. Do you object further, by saying, "are we not told that satan transformed himself into an angel of light, and is he not represented in the book of Revelations under the form of a great red dragon?" Yes; and you might add, "having seven heads, and ten horns, and crowns on his heads; yea, as having a pretty long tail, which could sweep from the firmament a third part of the stars and cast them to the earth." But brethren, is it correct to assume as true, that the devil is a fallen angel, and then recur to the symbolical language of Scripture for proof, which proofs, when adduced, render your doctrine ridiculous? Besides, have we not shown that such passages have no relation to such a subject? Is it still objected "does not the history of the world, since revelation was completed, furnish accounts of the devil appearing to men in various forms, conversing with them; of persons who have sold themselves, soul and body, to him, and at the agreed time he has come and carried them away, wholesale from the world?" Yes; verily such stories have been told. But if any minister among us should preach such nonsense to the people, he might be looking out for another parish, in some other quarter of the globe. If any man among us should seriously say he had seen the devil, and conversed with him, his friends would soon procure

a place for him in the insane hospital. Do our orthodox friends believe such childish stories themselves? They would smile at me if I even suggested that they had any faith in them; still, however, they continue to preach that an angel fell from heaven, has ruined the whole human race, deceives them, walks about seeking whom he may devour, and that he will be the eternal tormentor of a considerable portion of them. Yet no person has ever seen him or conversed with him, nor do the Scriptures teach his existence, when carefully and candidly examined.

3d. *If an angel fell from heaven before the sin of our first parents, how do our orthodox brethren account for the fact, that the Jews, to whom were committed the oracles of God, were obliged to go to Babylon to get information about him?* Moses says nothing about him; nor delivers any injunctions to Israel concerning him. Nor, until after the Babylonish captivity, does it appear that such a being was known in Judea, except as an evil god among the heathen nations. We would ask our brethren, affectionately, how they account for this, if their views of the devil are drawn from divine revelation? The Old Testament writers use the term satan, but never use it to designate an angel who fell from heaven. They had the name, but wanted the evil being to whom they could apply it.

4th. *It is a notorious fact, not easily accounted for on Scripture ground, that people in these days make very different uses of the terms devil and satan from what were made in the days of the inspired writers.* I shall give an example or two of what I mean. First, you never find in those days, as in these, persons apologising for crimes by blaming the devil. Nor do you find that any one ever made the devil a bugbear for

the purpose of frightening their children into obedience. Nor does the devil appear to have been any object of fear, to old or young, by night or by day.—Besides, though men in ancient times, as in these, were given to cursing and swearing, yet you do not find that any of them had learned to swear by the devil. An instance is not on record, of one in a passion or otherwise, who ever wished any of his fellow creatures to go to hell or the devil. In old times, people swore by the name of the Lord, and cursed each other by their gods, but no one seems to have known how to swear by satan or the devil. And it is equally certain, that no inspired writer seems to have known how to give such horrible descriptions of the devil and hell torments, as is frequently done by modern preachers. But it is well known, that many damn their hearers to endless hell torments, and send them without much ceremony to the devil; and is it any matter of surprise, that their hearers in a less genteel way should do the same? So long as we have so much unscriptural, not to say profane talk about the devil and hell torments in the pulpit, let us cease to wonder that similar profane, silly language should salute our ears in the streets almost at every corner.

5th. *The Old Testament is often quoted in the New, and quoted to show what was the faith of believers during that dispensation, but is never quoted or alluded to, showing that any of them believed the devil to be a fallen angel.* They neither announce this as an Old Testament doctrine, nor as a new revelation from God under the gospel dispensation. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness, but it is not said of any one that he believed in a fallen angel, called the devil; and that this was of use to him in any way. We have seen, that both

Old and New Testament writers frequently speak of satan and the devil, and we appeal to the candor of our brethren to say, whether the Scripture writers would have applied these terms to good and bad men, to the angel of Jehovah, to men's evil passions, and to a piece of writing, had they considered them appropriate titles of the worst being in the universe, and the implacable enemy of God and man?

6th. *It is a fact, that in every country where the Bible is not known, or not studied where it is known, there superstitious notions have prevailed concerning witches, evil spirits, ghosts, and the devil: and just in proportion as it has been known and studied all such superstitions have gradually been exploded and renounced by the people.* For example, not many centuries ago, it was firmly believed by all the Christian world, that human beings could become witches and wizards. It was also believed, that they were in league with the devil, and could perform very extraordinary things. See Mather's Magnalia. When the tragical scenes of the Salem witchcraft were acting, the man who would have written against it, as I do now against the devil, would have been an object of universal execration. But I doubt if you can find in the town of Salem an intelligent man who has the least faith in the doctrine of witchcraft. Even the devil himself now, with all his extraordinary powers, does not excite one half the attention which a few witches did in those days. Let him muster all the priestcraft and superstition left in the land to his assistance, he could not procure a jury of twelve men to condemn a single individual to death for being in league with him. It was a dark day for the devil when witchcraft declined, for from that hour his popularity has been on the wane, it being one of

his chief supports. All their powers were derived from him. Now, it is believed they never had any, and people are as much puzzled to explain how a human being could become a witch or a wizard, as how a holy angel in heaven could become a devil. But while people are generally agreed that witchcraft was all a piece of superstition and do justice to the devil in freeing him from all blame about it, yet they still continue to believe in his existence and extraordinary powers. We look back with surprise to the days when our fathers burned the witches, and throw the mantle of charity over them. Our children will have to do the same for us a century hence. Will they not have to say—"Strange that our fathers should say the power of witches was all a piece of superstition yet not see that the power of the devil was no better. Strange that they should perceive all the proofs of witchcraft were mistaken views of the Bible, and yet think their proofs of a personal devil correct: strange, that they should discard witches as imaginary beings yet believe their father the devil to be a real being. Their devil never performed such wonders as witches have done. Did their devil ever bring a good man from the state of the dead to converse with the living as did the witch of Endor? Strange, beyond measure strange, that our fathers should so completely discard witchcraft as a superstition which the Jews imbibed from the Canaanites, where no devil was known, and yet continue to believe in the devil, a superstition which the Jews imbibed at Babylon many ages after."—Thus will our children be surprised at our superstition and weakness, and will have to cover us with the mantle of their charity for our belief in the personality of the devil, as we do that of our fathers respecting witches.

That a great revolution of opinion has taken place about witches, ghosts, &c., no one can well deny.—Well, how has it been effected? Not by force, but by the slow, gradual influence of the light of truth.—The Bible has been more read and critically examined. Reason and common sense, formerly degraded, assume their proper place and dignity. The arts and sciences have been cultivated and the means of human knowledge greatly increased. Witchcraft, like the owl of the night, has fled before all this light, and no place is found for it this country. So will it be, and so let it be, until every superstition is banished from the earth.

7th. *It is also a fact, that the common opinions entertained of the devil, are at variance with other plain and acknowledged truths of the Bible.* I shall only give an example or two of this. The devil is generally accused of tempting men to sin. But when the Scriptures speak in plain languane, they inform us that men tempt each other to sin, Prov. i. 10. And that every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed, James i. 14, and iv. 1—4. In the popular language of the times, Judas' crimes are ascribed to the devil. But they are also ascribed to himself, Acts i. 18—26. Judas takes all the blame to himself—"I have betrayed the innocent blood."—By consulting the following texts, it may be seen that things are sometimes ascribed to the devil, to God, and to men. Luke xxii. 3; John xiii. 2, 27, 30; Acts ii. 23; 2 Sam. xiv. 1; 1 Chron. xxi. 1; 1 Kings xxii. 22, 23; James i. 13, 14; Jer. iv. 10; Ezek. xiv. 9; Compare 2 Thess. ii. 8—12; 1 John iii. 8; Gen. xlv. 6—8; xlii. 21, 22; Acts v. 3, and iv. 9. It is generally asserted that the devil is the secret agent in tempting men, and that he makes tools of

them ; but this is taken for granted as true, which ought to be proved true, for the Scriptures no where assert this.

8th. *It is also a fact, that men in sinning, are never conscious of the influence of the devil over them.* They have learned to say, that the devil influences men to sin, and sometimes blame the devil for their crimes ; but the personal consciousness and experience of every man declares, that no such influence was felt, nor was it needed. An evil influence is felt, but it is the influence of our own lusts and passions, *drawing us away* and *enticing us.* The Scripture devil does tempt us, but not a fallen angel, as is commonly believed.

9th. *It is also a fact, that the common opinions entertained of the devil, whether right or wrong, are the effect of early education and popular opinion.* With most people, reason, common sense, and the Bible, had nothing to do in forming such opinions, but they have been implicitly received by tradition from their fathers. They say they believe them, but cannot tell why, except that they were so taught, for they have never exercised their reason or studied the Bible to see whether they are true or false. Even when a person determines to examine such opinions, his early prejudices within, and popular opinion without, overawe and deter him from giving free scope to his investigations. We speak here from experience, for these have been powerfully felt in the course of this discussion.

10th. *The last fact which I shall mention is, that allowing the personal existence of the devil fully proved, it is beyond all doubt, that he has been much misrepresented, and his character abused by many Christian people.* I shall only give an instance or two. For many ages he was accused of making witches

and wizards. Now it is allowed no such beings ever existed, but the whole was a piece of superstition and an astonishing instance of human credulity. Again; for ages, and even now, what frightful descriptions have been given of the devil, in preaching. He has been accused, as being the tormentor of damned souls in hell, and imagination has been put to the utmost stretch, to describe his horrible modes of torture there. Now, not a word of this is true, for let the devil have his due, no scripture writer ever says a word about the devil as the tormentor of any one. In fact, many a railing, not to say wicked accusation has been brought against the devil, and though this is now allowed true, no apology is made for such shameful, unscriptural defamation. We readily excuse all this, for though preachers have declaimed against such a being in the pulpit, and terrified people with such horrible descriptions of him, all must have seen that they had no great faith in their own doctrine. They, like other people, live all the six days of the week without any fear or concern about him. The minister makes him a bugbear in the pulpit to frighten the parents, and parents at home make the same use of him to frighten their children, but both take care not to be much frightened themselves.

SECTION X.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

Any objections which have occurred to me against the views advanced, I shall fairly state and attempt to answer. It may then be objected

1st. "The devil, satan, or tempter, is spoken of as a real being. Personal pronouns are not only used in speaking of him, but he is represented as speaking and acting, and we are expressly informed of what he said and did." This objection has been partially adverted to in the course of our remarks, but I shall here notice it a little further. If all to which personal pronouns are applied, are to be considered real beings, we must admit many inanimate things, yea, qualities to be real beings as well as the devil. For example, the earth or land is personified, Job xxxi. 38. The heavens are also personified, Jer. ii. 12, 13. So is the sea, Job xxxviii. 8, 9. Death, the grave, and destruction are personified, Job xxviii. 22. 1 Cor. xv. 55. The hosts of heaven are personified, Psalm cxlviii. 1—5. See the whole Psalm. The mountains and hills can sing, and all the trees of the field can clap their hands, Isai. lv. 12. Wisdom, power, and a variety of good qualities, are personified in Scripture, and why not also bad qualities, yea, the principle of evil itself? In short, if things represented as speaking and acting, must be considered as real beings, and proofs of personal existence, then it is certain all inanimate creation ought to be considered real beings, for almost all things are represented as living, and speaking, and acting. Jotham's olive tree, fig tree, vine and bramble, must be considered living beings, for they are represented as holding a conversation together. Judg. ix. 7—16. Micaiah's speech to Ahab, 1 Kings xxii., must also be literally understood, and who does not perceive, what absurdities would ensue, if such a mode of interpretation was adopted.

2d. "If there be no foundation in Scripture for a fallen angel, called the devil, how came this opinion to obtain such universal currency among mankind? The

opinion, you say, was held by the Magians, and this evil being was considered their evil god, and called *ahraman*, and by the Greeks *arimanius*. Zoroaster called him "an angel of darkness," and other nations have had various other names for him. Now, as all counterfeit money implies current, must there not be a foundation in truth for such a universal belief of an evil being, call him devil, satan, or by any other name?" As this is the principal, and most popular objection, which can be advanced against my views, I shall spend some time in considering it. It is true that counterfeit money implies current, but do our orthodox friends believe, that counterfeit opinions in religion, always imply, that there is some foundation in Scripture for them? Do they allow, that there is some foundation in truth for a purgatory and the doctrine of transubstantiation? Do they believe, that there is any foundation in truth for witchcraft, for ghosts, and all the different grades of hobgoblins? Will they allow that there is a foundation in Scripture for all the wild and ridiculous opinions which have obtained currency in the world? If not, why assert that there must be for the common opinion concerning the devil? Is it not possible to invent a thousand things which have no foundation in the Bible? Error supposes truth, as counterfeit money supposes current, but is it true that every error is a corruption of truth? But it ought to be noticed, that Dean Prideaux did not consider the articles of Zoroaster's creed, quoted Section iv. as corruptions of truth, but consonant to the truth. Nor do Christians in our day, for they have adopted both the sentiments and language of his creed. Why then call them corruptions of the truth? If they are, why preach such corruptions for truth to the world? Do orthodox preachers tell the people, that such sentiments are greatly

corrupted, both as to matter and language? On the contrary, do they not solemnly assure their hearers, that such doctrines are the faithful sayings of God, though it is notorious Zoroaster taught them six hundred years before the days of Christ. Will they thank me for suggesting that there is any corruption in the case? If they believe such opinions have any corruption about them, why not purge them, and preach only the unadulterated truth of God? Why pass as current Bible doctrine, such counterfeit opinions on the public? Although there is no law to punish men for passing counterfeit opinions in religion, yet one should think, their own doctrine of eternal misery, if they believed it, would be sufficient to deter them.

If the universal belief in a devil, proves that there is a foundation in truth for the opinion, then Paganism, Mahometanism, and Roman Catholicism, have all a foundation in truth, for they have all in their turn been pretty universally believed. Purgatory, transubstantiation, witchcraft, and a thousand other opinions, ought not to be discarded, for they were once generally believed. Many good and learned men believed them, and thought their proofs for them as good as those now adduced concerning the devil. Why are they rejected? Because, attention to the Bible has shown they are not taught there, and closer attention to it will show also, that the common opinions concerning the devil are equally false. But if the above objection had any real force, or the reasoning employed be correct, our orthodox friends will allow, that universal salvation, and that there is no devil, are opinions, which may have some foundation in the Scriptures, and that should they ever come to be universally believed, this universal reception would make them true. But will they admit such reasoning as correct?

How such an opinion, as that concerning an evil being called the devil, came first to exist among men, has been partly accounted for in Section iii. and iv.—Christians learned this opinion from the Jews, the Jews learned it from Zoroaster's creed, and Zoroaster learned it from the ancient Magian religion. Well, it may be asked, how came the Magians to imbibe such an opinion? I would first answer this question by asking another. How came the Sabians to worship idols?—Was there any foundation in Scripture for this? But, the apostle in Rom. i. answers the question, how all such deviations from truth originated. Men when they knew God glorified him not as God, they became vain in their imaginations, their foolish heart was darkened; and professing themselves to be wise they became fools. See verses 21, 22, 23. Respecting the origin of an evil principle, which was afterwards personified and deified, Essenus thus writes p. 125. "Plutarch observes, that the doctrine of two contrary principles prevailed in all countries. The reason is obvious; evil abounded in every age and nation: and as men could not reconcile the notion of natural and moral evil with an all-wise and benevolent author, it was natural for them to reason in the following manner: 'Since nothing can come into being without a cause; and since that which is perfectly good cannot be the cause of evil, then there must exist a distinct principle in nature, as well for the production of evil as of that which is good.' In this manner argued the Persian sages; and Plutarch seems to have considered the argument conclusive. This doctrine was introduced into Judea before the age of Isaiah, who, as we have seen, thus sets it aside: 'I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things.' xlv. 7."

3d. It may also be objected, "you have said, that

the doctrine of an evil principle deified, was known as early as the days of Job, which was about the time of Moses: but is not this too early a date for the existence of such an opinion among men, and is there any proof that it existed at such a date?" Some notice was taken of this objection, Section iii. and I shall here add a few remarks in reply to it. It is then certain, that the worship of idols prevailed in the world before the days of Moses. If the question is examined, did the worship of idols or that of an evil principle first prevail? we think the evidence will be in favor of the latter. But, we have found it impossible to ascertain dates as to the first origin of either, both being lost in antiquity, where no dates are given. Essenus, quoting from Plutarch, says p. 74. "'There are others again, who call the good principle only God, giving the name of Demon to the evil being; in which number is Zoroaster the Magian, who is said to have lived 5000 years before the Trojan war. Now, this philosopher calls the good principle Oromazes, and the evil one Arimanius; adding, moreover, that as of all sensible beings, the former bears the greatest resemblance to light, so the latter was most like darkness.' § xlv. 40. The doctrine here stated is undoubtedly very ancient; but the earliness of the period in which Zoroaster is said to have lived is absurd and must have proceeded from that propensity in which all nations indulged to magnify their own antiquity." Further; Mr. Mayo, in his Ancient Geography, says, p. 37, "the Scythians, whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia under their king Tanus, attack Vexores king of Egypt, conquer Asia, and establish the Scythian empire fifteen hundred years before Ninus, or three thousand six hundred and sixty years before Christ." And quoting from Mr. Pinkerton concerning "the aboriginal Scy-

thian empire of Persia," he thus writes: p. 23. "And beyond this there is no memorial of human affairs, save in Egypt alone, the history of which begins with *Menes*, the first king, about four thousand years before our era; while the earliest appearance of the *Scythians* in history is about four hundred years after, when Vexores was king of Egypt, and Tanus of the Scythæ—not to mention the collateral light derived from the whole history of the Greeks and Romans, who were Scythæ, as just shown." He adds, on the same page—"on this route we shall find the *Scythians*, Getae, or Goths, not only peopling all *Scandenavia* and *Germany*, but extending hence and actually possessing Gaul and Spain five hundred years before Christ, as well as Britain and Ireland three hundred years before Christ." From these statements the following things are obvious:

1st. That the Magian religion is very ancient, extending so far back into antiquity that no distinct account of its origin is to be found on record. If such a thing is in existence we have been unable to find it.—2d. That the people to whom the Christian religion was first preached, from the very nature of the case, must have been previously imbued with the tenets of the Magian religion. It was preached first to the Jews, who had spent seventy years in captivity at Babylon, where we have seen that the Magian religion prevailed. It was also preached by the apostles to the Greeks and Romans, whom Mr. Mayo says, "were Scythians," and "whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia," the very place where Prideaux, above quoted, says the Magian religion first originated. 3d. Mr. Mayo's statements also show us how the tenets of the Magian religion were diffused throughout Europe. He says, "the Scythians whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia" we shall find "not only peo-

pling all *Scandenavia* and *Germany*, but extending hence and actually possessing Gaul and Spain five hundred years before Christ, as well as Britain and Ireland three hundred years before Christ." The Magian religion being the ancient religion of Persia, when the people from thence overran Scandenavia, Germany, Gaul, Spain, Britain and Ireland, several hundred years before Christ, they must have carried its principles along with them. A miracle was necessary to prevent Christianity being blended with them when introduced into those countries. That it has been blended with them, we think proved in preceding Sections.

We have then all the evidence which the nature of the case will admit, that the doctrine of an evil principle deified, was known among men in the days of Job. If our orthodox brethren deny this, and can prove that their devil had another or better origin, we respectfully request them to prove it.

Such are the chief objections, which are likely to be made against my views of the devil, excepting such as might be made against any innovation in religious popular opinions. But as these have been stated and answered in my Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. to it I refer the reader. In concluding this Section I would merely remark, that many have good reason to object against my views, for if they are true, what a great loss they must sustain in being robbed of their principal topics of preaching and religious conversation. The devil and eternal hell torments are themes on which many delight to dwell. They seem health to their navel and marrow to their bones, and to remove these is taking away their gods, and what have they more?

SECTION XI.

CONCLUDING REMARKS, POINTING OUT SOME OF THE EVILS WHICH HAVE ARISEN FROM THE COMMON OPINIONS ENTERTAINED OF THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

It would be an endless task to detail all the evils which have resulted from the common opinions entertained of the devil. A few only I shall name, and leave the reader to pursue the subject. If it then be true, as I have attempted to show, that no such being as the devil exists, let the reader consider

1st. What a vast number of passages in God's word have been perverted in proof of this doctrine. They are almost innumerable. Is there no evil then in misunderstanding and perverting God's word? No man will say so, who loves it, and trembles at it. It is one of the greatest of all evils, for it has been the fruitful source of most evils which have existed in the world. If this doctrine be false what a great change it produces on the whole face of the Bible.

2d. Let the reader consider the evil effects of this doctrine on mankind. A belief in the common opinions concerning the devil, has laid the foundation for almost every other superstition among Christians. Take into view also, what unnecessary and distressing fears the belief of such opinions has given to children, and even persons of riper years. And who can tell the distress which they have given people, when closing their mortal career. On weak minds, their influence has been such as to drive some to madness, and others to

suicide. Most people would dismiss a domestic, if found frightening their children with ghosts and hobgoblins: but these same people cheerfully pay a man to frighten both them and their children, one day in the week, with the devil. The devil, with many people, is much more feared than God. But what an excellent apology have such opinions afforded men for their sins. The devil has been obliged to bear the blame, while men have had all the pleasure of sinning. By such opinions, men's attention has been turned away from the true devil within them, to an invisible, imaginary being, called the devil, without them. While a deceived heart has been drawing them aside from truth and holiness, the doctrine of the devil helps to calm their fears, stupifies their conscience, and emboldens them to repeat their crimes. And why should it not, if it be true, that such a powerful, deceitful being as the devil, is continually influencing them to sin?

3d. The common opinions concerning the devil, are highly dishonorable to the character of God. We have never seen the least attempt made to show how such a being as the devil was for the honor of God's character. On the contrary, it is believed, that sin dishonors God, and why not also the devil, the author of sin?—But if any man can explain, how the devil can be for the honor of God, either here or hereafter, we should be glad to see it done. How such a being, with such extraordinary powers, with this world for his range of wickedness, and existing forever the enemy of God and the tormentor of men, can be for the honor of Jehovah's character, is beyond all my feeble powers to comprehend. It seems to argue, that God could not, or would not prevent his existence. That he cannot, or will not curtail his powers, confine him, restore him,

or strike him out of existence. This evil, once introduced, is without remedy and without end. It is certainly a poor account of God to tell us, that the glory and honor of his character, is inseparable from the devil and that the eternal misery of this being with multitudes of mankind, are to promote the glory of God forever. If this be glory and honor, pray what is dishonor or disgrace?

4th. The common opinions concerning the devil and satan, with others generally held, have tended to land men in downright infidelity. Is it any matter of surprise that men become infidels, when such opinions are presented to them as the religion of Jesus Christ? Is it not rather matter of wonder that all men are not infidels? Cast your eyes round the whole world, and say, if infidelity has not had its hot-bed, in the countries where such absurd and ridiculous opinions have been palmed on the world for religion by interested priests. Neither infidelity, nor idolatry, can be conquered or prevented, but by the truth of God.

5th. Such opinions mixed with the religion of Jesus Christ, have been in time past, and must be while they are retained, a great hindrance to the universal reception of Christianity in the world. It is a question of no ordinary kind to a reflecting mind, Is the religion of Jesus Christ presented to the heathen in its pure unadulterated state? Or, are we introducing to them a human creed, containing articles derived from Zoroaster and the Grecian philosophy, and only supplanting one system of ignorance, superstition, and cruelty, by establishing another in some respects worse? Viewing the creeds taught the heathen generally, let us see if this is saying any thing but the truth. Christian missionaries teach only one God, but this God they divide

into three. But passing this, I ask, what heathen god ever called on its votaries to believe that he had *elected* some to everlasting happiness before they were born, and had *left*, not to say *doomed* all the rest to endless misery? Heathen gods have required parents to sacrifice their children to them, women to immolate themselves on the funeral piles of their husbands, and hecatombs of old and young have been slaughtered to appease their wrath; but name the heathen god, if you can, that ever required its worshippers to be willing to be damned in order that he might save them? And, when did any of them ever teach their worshippers, that their happiness in heaven will be greatly increased by the sight of their nearest and dearest relatives writhing under eternal torments? I call on our orthodox brethren to name the heathen god, who ever taught such doctrines, or ever bore such a cruel, horrible character; and to crown the climax of his nameless wickedness said, "*all this was done for the display of his glorious character.*" Who would be a Christian if this be the Christian's God? Who would not be a Pagan to get rid of such a God?

Is it said—"Missionaries do not teach such things to the heathen?" It will certainly afford me pleasure to find that they do not. But did they not teach such things here, before they went far hence unto the Gentiles to teach them? If they taught them here, why not there? Presuming, then, that such doctrines are taught to the heathen, permit me to ask, what an intelligent heathen might be expected to say to such Missionaries? He might surely with great propriety say something like the following —"Gentlemen Missionaries—You have been at some trouble, and considerable expense, in coming here to teach us about your God

and religion. While we thank you for your good intentions, we must say, that we cannot change our own gods for yours, or add one more to the gods we have already, unless he is a good, kind, and merciful God.—Our own gods are cruel enough, but if your God be as you describe him, to receive him as our God, would only be to add to our miserable condition. We have had all the tender feelings of our hearts torn to pieces, in seeing our infants and relations tortured to death to satisfy our present gods. But bad as they are, none of them ever made such cruel demands on us as yours do on you. No, none of them ever demanded of us to believe, that our eternal felicity would be increased, by beholding others in misery, and that we ourselves must be willing to be damned for their glory, or we never can be saved by them. You have come a great way to tell us that all our gods are but dumb idols. Perhaps this may be true; but unless you suppose us heathen, devoid of all feeling and common sense, how could you ever suppose, that we would renounce our earthly cruel false gods, for an eternally cruel true one. Return to your employers, with our thanks for their good intentions towards us, and when we send Missionaries to your country, they shall bring you thousands of gods all better than the one you propose to us. Bad as our gods are, none of them like yours, allows a devil to ruin us here, and torment us forever in the world to come. Our fathers knew about your devil, and you have borrowed a considerable part of your creed, from what they were taught many years before your religion existed, and yet you come to tell us things which we knew long before, as wonderful revelations from your God. Whether your impudence, is not as great as you think our ignorance to be, you

may reflect about, on your passage home. Fare you well."

To conclude. If we wish the heathen to cast their idols to the moles and to the bats, let us cast our devil and many other false opinions out of the Christian religion, and let us both say, what have we any more to do with idols, or with the devil? the Lord, he is our God, and we will serve him.

END OF THE FIRST PART.

PART II.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE EXTENT OF DURATION EXPRESSED BY THE TERMS OLIM, AION, AND AIONION, RENDERED EVERLASTING, FOREVER, &c. IN THE COMMON VERSION, ESPECIALLY WHEN APPLIED TO PUNISHMENT.

SECTION I.

ALL THE TEXTS NOTICED WHERE OLIM OCCURS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, BUT IS RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH DO NOT EXPRESS OR IMPLY ETERNAL DURATION.

Taylor, in his Hebrew concordance, on the word *olim*, says, "The word is applied to time, and signifieth a duration which is concealed, as being of an unknown or great length, with respect either to time past or to come." After quoting some texts, which he supposed proof of this, he adds: "it signifies *eternity*, not from the proper force of the word, but when the sense of the place, or the nature of the subject to which it is applied requireth it; as God and his attributes." As he refers to no text to show, that when applied to punishment it signifies eternity, it may, I think, be inferred,

that he did not think it was ever so applied. Parkhurst, on the word *olim*, says, "it seems to be much more frequently used for an indefinite than for infinite time." And in his Greek Lexicon, on the words *aion* and *aionios*, he says, that the Hebrew word *olim* answers as the corresponding word for these two words in the Greek of the Seventy, "which words denote time hidden from man, whether indefinite or definite, whether past or future." Professor Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Miller, p. 128, commenting on Mic. v. 1, says: "the words *kedesh* and *od*, rendered by Turretine, *eternity*, are like the Greek *aion*, that also signifies any thing ancient, which has endured or is to endure for a long period. The question when these words are to have the sense of *ancient* or *very old*, is always to be determined by the nature of the case, i. e. by the context."

Concessions, such as these, from critics on the language of Scripture, ought to lead every man to examine, if these terms are ever used in the Bible to express the endless duration of punishment. Mr. Stuart's rule, if applied with attention to the general usage of these terms, would soon cool the zeal of many people, who seem to dwell with peculiar delight on the endless duration of punishment to their fellow creatures. It is evident, that the translators of the common version were fully aware, that *olim* was often used by the sacred writers to express a limited period of time, for 1st. They render it *continuance*, Isai. lxiv. 5.

2d. *Ancient*, and apply it to *landmarks*, Prov. xxii. 28. To *people*, Isai. xliv. 7. To *paths*, Jer. xviii. 15. To *high places*, Ezek. xxxvi. 2. To *nations*, Jer. v. 15. To *times*, Psalm lxxvii. 5, which is explained to mean *old*. Had *olim* in these texts been rendered eternal, or everlasting, as in some other places, the impropriety would be very manifest. We would

then have had an eternal landmark, an everlasting people, eternal paths, and everlasting high places; yea, an everlasting nation, and eternal times. But they had no idea that this word always expressed endless duration, and accordingly rendered it *ancient* as the context of the passages demanded. In the last text they have rendered *olim* both by the word *old* and *ancient*, which if rendered eternal or everlasting, the passages would read thus: "I have considered the days of everlasting, the years of eternal times."

3d. *Olim* is rendered *old* and is equivalent to ancient, as in the last class of passages. Thus the "days of old" is explained to mean "the years of many generations," Deut. xxxii. 7, Isai. lxiii. 9, comp. verse 11, which shows that the days of old refer to the days of Moses, Jer. vi. 16, Lam. iii. 6, Amos ix. 11, Mic. vii. 14, Mal. iii. 4. In this last text "days of old" is explained to be "former years," and in the margin our translators have put "ancient years." See also Job xxii. 15, Prov. xxiii. 10, Isai. lviii. 12, where we read of the "old way" the "old landmark" and "the old waste places." The explanation given in this last text is "thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations." The same is repeated, chap. lxi. 4. In the following texts *olim* is rendered *old* and is applied to a variety of things, which it would only be a waste of time to particularize. Ezek. xxv. 15, Jer. xxviii. 8, Gen. vi. 4, 1 Sam. xxvii. 8, Psalm cxix. 52, Isai. xlvi. 9, Comp. verse 10, Ezek. xxvi. 20, Josh. xxiv. 2, Jer. ii. 20, Psalm xxv. 6, Isai. lvii. 11 and li. 9, "ancient days" and "generations old" are used as explanatory of each other. Eccles. i. 10. Such are all the texts in which *olim* is rendered old, and on which we shall submit a few brief remarks. Let it be then supposed

for a moment, that it had been rendered everlasting, or by any other word which has the idea of endless duration affixed to it, what would follow? It may be observed as an example, that men are called on to remember the days of everlasting, that God carried Israel all the days of everlasting, and that some are spoken of as dead from everlasting. Besides; the everlasting waste places were to be built, and the giants were from everlasting, men of renown. Whoever chooses to go over all the above texts will see, that to translate *olim* everlasting or eternal, would involve the inspired writers in the grossest absurdities. It is evident, that in all these texts, as in the preceding, *olim* rendered old, signifies ancient. Though it expresses a long, indefinite period of time, yet it would not be very difficult to ascertain, in some instances at least, how many years were meant. If *olim* then, in any text rendered everlasting or eternal, does convey the sense of endless duration, it is obvious that it cannot have this meaning in any of the texts which have yet been brought to view. Both the texts and their contexts forbid this, and we have seen, that an explanation is given of this word by the sacred writers to prevent all misapprehension on the subject.

4th. In the following places *olim* is rendered *any*, *long*, *any time*, *long time*, *long home*, and *long dead*. Levit. xxv. 32; Isai. xlii. 14; Eccles. xii. 5; Psalm cxliii. 3. To understand *olim* as meaning everlasting in these texts, would make the inspired writers to say, that some have been eternally dead, that the grave is man's everlasting home, and that God has eternally held eternally held his peace.

5th. In the following texts *olim* is rendered *world*. Psalm lxxiii. 12; Eccles. iii. 11; Isai. lxiv. 4. The

language used, John ix. 32, seems to be taken from this last text, and in both, the meaning seems to be, since the *age* began, probably referring to the Mosaic age or dispensation. In Isai. xlv. 17, it is said, "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded, world without end." Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says it signifies "the ages of perpetuity." I would merely suggest it for consideration, if the phrase "world without end," does not refer to the age or dispensation of the Messiah, which age was not to be succeeded by any other, and corresponds to passages in the New Testament where it is said to be *everlasting*, and to endure *forever*. Whatever may be in this, we think it is evident that *olim* rendered *world*, in these texts, does not mean endless duration. How does it sound to say, that God sets eternity in the hearts of men, and that the ungodly prosper in the eternity!—*Olim*, rendered world in these texts, seems to be used in a similar sense as *aion* and *aionion* translated world, in the New Testament. Age, in both, would be a better rendering, for surely neither the material world nor eternity can be referred to.

6th. In Jer. xlix. 36 *olim* is translated "*outcasts*." Why it is so I cannot conceive. As it cannot affect the subject under consideration, it would not be of much use to spend time in inquiring.

7th. In Deut. xxxiii. 15, the word *olim* is rendered "lasting." By quoting the whole verse it will be seen, that *lasting hills* in the last part, is just another expression for *ancient mountains* in the first; "and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills." It will be seen presently, that *olim* here translated *ancient* and *last-*

ing, and applied to the mountains and hills, might just as well have been translated everlasting, as it is in Gen. xlix. 26, and Hab. iii. 6, and applied to the same things. But I forbear further remarks until we come to those passages.

8th. I find that *olim* is rendered *alway*, and *always*, Jer. xx. 17; Gen. vi. 3; 1 Chron. xvi. 15; Job vii. 16; Psalm cxix. 112. In this last text David explains *always*, by adding, "even unto the end." But everlasting or eternity has no end.

9th. Sometimes *olim* is rendered *any more*.—Ezek. xxvii. 36, and xxviii. 19. The prophet is speaking of Tyre, and the sense evidently is, that it should not be any more, as formerly, a place famous for trade.

10th. It is rendered *never*, in the following places: 2 Sam. xii. 10; Judg. ii. 1; Psalm xv. 5; xxx. 6; xxxi. 1; lv. 22; lxxi. 1; and cxix. 93; Prov. x. 30; Isai. xiv. 20; xxv. 2; Ezek. xxvi. 21; Joel ii. 26, 27. But surely no one ever thought that *never* in these texts expresses endless duration. For example, was the sword not to depart from David's house to the endless ages of eternity? And was God's covenant with Israel to have no end? We are sure it has waxed old and vanished away. In short, we use the word *never* every day in a similar way, but no one interprets our language as meaning endless duration. In the New Testament we shall see that the word *aion* is also rendered *never*, and is applied in a similar way.

SECTION II.

ALL THE PASSAGES NOTICED, WHERE OLIM IS USED, AND RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH CONVEY THE IDEA OF ENDLESS DURATION.

If the sacred writers used the term *olim*, to express limited duration in so many instances, as we have seen in the preceding Section, our translators rendering the same word by English terms expressing endless duration, can never give it such a signification. In the texts now to be introduced, they have rendered *olim* by the words perpetual, everlasting, eternal, forever, and forever and ever; but can such renderings alter the sense in which the sacred writers used it? No; for we shall see that the things to which it is applied, and the scope of the contexts, in a great many instances, at least, utterly forbid it. This is universally acknowledged, and will presently be seen from the passages. It will be perceived, that this word is used to express duration that is past. The reader has then to consider, whether it refers to *endless* duration which is past. It also expresses duration to come, and it must be considered, whether it is used to express a proper eternity to come. In short, we have to examine with attention, whether this word, rendered perpetual, eternal, forever, and forever and ever, was designed to express the endless duration of the things to which the sacred writers apply it. The question is not, are the persons or things to which it is applied of endless duration in their natures, but was this term used to ex-

press it? Is it this word which shows they are of endless duration?

1st. I find *olim*, then, is rendered "*perpetual*," and applied in the following manner. The covenant God made with Noah was to be "for perpetual generations," Gen. ix. 12. The priest's office, was to be Aaron's and his son's, "for a perpetual statute," Exod. xxix. 9. The suburbs of certain cities, were to be the inheritance of the Levites, "for a perpetual possession," Levit. xxv. 34. Certain portions were to be the provision of Aaron and his sons, by "a perpetual statute;" Levit. xxiv. 9. It was to be, "a perpetual statute," that the person who sprinkled the water of separation, should be unclean until the even, Num. xix. 21. The Sabbath was to be observed by the children of Israel, throughout their generations, "for a perpetual covenant," Exod. xxxi. 16. To them it was also to be "a perpetual statute," that they should neither eat fat nor blood, Levit. iii. 17. The meat-offering was to be "a perpetual ordinance unto the Lord," Ezek. xlvi. 14. And the children of Israel are spoken of as saying, come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in "a perpetual covenant," Jer. l. 5. In all these passages, the word perpetual is applied to things belonging to the Mosaic dispensation, which was never intended to be endless in its duration. *Olim* is rendered perpetual in these passages, and it is rendered everlasting in others, and applied to the same things. Indeed, had our translators consulted uniformity in their version, they would have always rendered it so. What then does perpetual or everlasting express, when applied to the things belonging to the Jewish dispensation? We think it is obvious that it simply signifies that those things were to be observed by the Jews while that dispensation con-

tinued. When it ended, the everlasting or perpetual ended.

But further; we find *olim* rendered perpetual, and applied as follows. Speaking of Babylon, and other places, it is said they shall be made "perpetual desolations," Jer. xxv. 9, 12; Ezek. xxxv. 9; Zeph. ii. 9. And of Bozrah, and other cities, that they shall be "perpetual wastes," Jer. xlix. 13. And speaking of some persons it is said, Psalm lxxviii. 66, that God would put them to "a perpetual reproach." God also threatened Israel, Jer. xviii. 16, to make their land a "perpetual hissing;" and bring on them "a perpetual shame," xxiii. 40. Concerning the people of Seir it is said, that they had against Israel "a perpetual hatred," Ezek. xxxv, 5. Of some persons it is said, they shall sleep "a perpetual sleep," Jer. li. 39, and repeated, verse 57. Besides, we find it said, Jer. v. 22, that the Lord placed "the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree that it cannot pass it." Moreover, we find it declared, Hab. iii. 6, that the hills are perpetual. "He stood, and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations: and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are everlasting." In this last text, *olim* is rendered both perpetual and everlasting, and without scruple is applied to the hills and mountains as well as to the ways of God. These are all the texts in which *olim* is rendered in our version perpetual. On the whole of them I shall now make a few brief remarks.

1st. It is evident from the last quoted text, that perpetual and everlasting are used to express the same idea. The "everlasting mountains," and "the perpetual hills," are synonymous expressions. When it is, therefore, said that the mountains and hills are per-

petual or everlasting, few ever inferred that they had existed from eternity, or would exist to endless duration. The everlasting nature of their existence as to time past, is limited to the time of their creation, and in regard to futurity, their existence is bounded by the dissolution of the present world. Here then is an everlasting, bounded by time, and does not extend to endless duration, either as to the past or future.

2d. In all the above texts, where *olim* is rendered perpetual, it is never used to express endless duration. The things to which it is applied clearly decide this. Unless this world is to continue to endless duration, how is the sand to be a perpetual bound to the sea, and the hills and mountains never cease to exist?—Moreover, how is Babylon and other places to be endless desolations? In short, if perpetual expresses endless duration, some are to sleep to endless duration. The question, perhaps, may then be asked, How long does perpetual mean in the above texts? To this I answer, that in all of them it does not designate the same period of time. The longest period expressed by it is not extended beyond the existence of this world.—In the place where it is said some were to sleep a perpetual sleep, the Babylonians are referred to; they were asleep when their city was taken, and being killed while asleep, they no more awoke in this world, and hence their sleep is called perpetual. If perpetual is understood to mean endless, those persons are never to be raised from the dead. Such, then, as maintain a universal resurrection of all the dead, must give up the idea that *olim*, rendered perpetual, signifies a proper eternity.

3d. Let it be noticed, that in none of the above texts, is a reference made to the punishment of the wicked in a future state. But even admitting, that in a number of them it had been expressly declared, that

the wicked, and the wicked in a future state of existence, should be punished with perpetual torments, this would prove nothing conclusive that these torments were to have no end. This must be obvious to every man who considers how often perpetual is applied to things which have ended, and to things also which we are sure are to end. From the common usage of this word, we ought to conclude that the torments of the wicked may come to an end also. But as nothing is said about future punishment in any of the above texts, we need not trouble ourselves with any further remarks concerning them. I may just add, what difference can it make as to the meaning of the word *olim*, whether we render it everlasting or perpetual? Can the rendering alter the true sense of the writer?

2. We find also, that *olim* is renedred *everlasting*. The covenant that God made with Noah and every living creature, is called "the everlasting covenant," Gen. ix. 16. Also, that which he made with Abraham and his seed, is called "an everlasting covenant," Gen. xvii. 7, 13, 19. It is called the same when confirmed to Israel, 1 Chron. xvi. 17; Psalm cv. 10; and also to David, 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. And it is said of Israel, Isai. xxiv. 5, that they had "broken the everlasting covenant." In the following places, an everlasting covenant is spoken of, and seems to refer to the new covenant, Isai. lv. 3, and lxi. 8; Jer, xxxii. 40; Ezek. xvi. 60, and xxxvii. 26. But in whatever way this may be decided, all will allow, that it must end when Christ delivers up the kingdom to God the father. The new dispensation, or age of the Messiah, is not called everlasting because it is endless in its duration, but because when it ends it is to be succeeded by no other. But further, we find the land of Canaan promised to Israel for "an everlasting posses-

sion," Gen. xvii. 8, and xlviii. 4. The priesthood given to Aaron and his sons, was to be "an everlasting priesthood." But as an explanation of what is meant, it is added, "throughout your generations."—See Exod. xl. 15; Numb. xxv. 13. Certain things under the Aaronical priesthood, and connected with that covenant, though temporary in its duration, were to be for an "everlasting statute," Levit. xxiv. 8, 16, 24. In Gen. xlix. 26, we read of the everlasting hills, and in Hab. iii. 6, of the everlasting mountains, and in Psalm xxiv. 7, 9, of the everlasting doors, probably referring to the doors of the temple.

Before adducing any more of the texts in which *olim* is rendered everlasting, I beg leave to make one or two remarks. It is easily perceived, by comparing these texts with those where *olim* is rendered perpetual, that everlasting and perpetual express the same idea. Further; unless we can prove that the land of Canaan, the statutes and ordinances of the Jewish dispensation, the hills and mountains, and the doors of the temple, are to continue to endless duration, we ought not to say that the word everlasting expresses a proper eternity. We presume, no one would contend that it does, but some perhaps would say, that it does express the endless duration of the new covenant, mentioned in some of the above passages. But why should it any more mean this when applied to it, than when applied to the old covenant, which was called everlasting, yet has long ago vanished? Is it then asked, What does everlasting mean in the above texts? I answer: it expresses a period of time, long, indefinite, and limited. Do we read of the priesthood of Aaron being everlasting? We find this, in as many words limited, for it is added, "throughout your generations." In a word, any long period of time, either

past, or to come, is called everlasting. Yea, we shall see before we are done, that it sometimes expresses even a short period of time. Nor are the sacred writers under any apprehension that they were liable to be misunderstood. But to return.

We find further, *olim* rendered everlasting, and applied as follows. In Isai. xlv. 17, it is said—"But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation." This is explained by what follows: "ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." See this text noticed before. Daniel ix. 24, speaks of an "everlasting righteousness," and David, Psalm cxii. 6, says, "the righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance." In Prov. x. 25, they are also said to be "an everlasting foundation." David prays, Psalm cxxxix. 24, "lead me in the way everlasting." And in Jer. xxxi. 3, God says, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love." And in Isaiah lx. 19, 20, it is twice said that "God is their everlasting light." And in Isai. xxxv. 10, they shall come to Zion with "everlasting joy." This is repeated, li. 11, and lxi. 7. In Isai. lvi. 5, God is said to give them an "everlasting name," and to have made to himself "an everlasting name," Isai. lxiii. 12. In Isai. lv. 13, we read of an "everlasting sign," and by way of explanation it is added, "which shall not be cut off." And in Isai. liv. 8, we read of God's "everlasting kindness."—Speaking of the Jews, God threatened that he would bring upon them "an everlasting reproach." Jer. xxiii. 40. And in Jer. xx. 11, it is added, "their everlasting confusion shall never be forgotten." By consulting the context of these last two texts it may be seen that God is not speaking of punishment to the Jews in a future state, but of his temporal judgments in the present world. Notwithstanding this, their pun-

ishment is called everlasting. This we have shown, in the inquiry into the words Sheol, &c., which see. See also on 2 Thess. chap. i., below.

We come now to a part of this Inquiry where *olim* is rendered everlasting, and is applied to God himself. Such texts, then, demand the closest attention. I find it then said, Gen. xxi. 33, that Abraham "called upon the name of the Lord, the everlasting God." In Isai. xl. 28, he is again called the "everlasting God."—in Deut. xxxiii. 27, we read of his "everlasting arms." In Psalm xc. 2, it is said "even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God." And in Jer. x. 10, he is called "an everlasting king." In Psalm c. 5, it is said, "his mercy is everlasting." In ciii. 17, it is added, "the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting." But by way of explanation, it is said, "his righteousness unto childrens' children." In xli. 13, it is said, "blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting, and to everlasting." This is repeated, Psalm cvi. 48. Again, it is said, Psalm xciii. 2, "thou art from everlasting," but in the first part of the verse it was said as an equivalent expression—"thy throne is established of old." In Isai. lxiii. 16, it is said—"thy name is from everlasting," and Psalm cxlv. 13, David says, "thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom;" but observe, it is added by way of explation, "and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." In the margin our translators have put, "of all ages." And in Isaiah xxvi. 4, it is said, "in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength," but in the margin they have put, "rock of ages." These are all the passages where *olim* is rendered everlasting and applied to God. There are two passages where it is so rendered, and applied to the Messiah. The first is Mic. v. 2, "whose goings forth hath been from of old,

from everlasting." See, on this text, Professor Stuart's remarks quoted, Sect. i. Here, *from of old* and *everlasting* are used as synonymous expressions for the same thing. This is similar to Psalm xciii. 2, noticed above. The other text is Prov. viii. 23, "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." Here, what is called *everlasting* in the first part, is explained in the second to be, "from the beginning." Has everlasting or a proper eternity a beginning?

3d. We find *olim* rendered for evermore in the following places. Thus it is said, Psalm xcii. 8, "but thou, Lord, art most high for evermore." And cxiii. 2, "blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth and for evermore." And cxv. 18, "but we will bless the Lord from this time forth and for evermore." Again it is said, 2 Sam. xxii. 51, the Lord "showeth mercy to his annointed, unto David, and to his seed for evermore." This is repeated, Psalm xviii. 50.—In 1 Chron. xvii. 14. God promised that Solomon's throne "should be established for evermore." And Psalm cxxi. 8, he promised to preserve Israel "for evermore." And cxxxiii. 3, to command "the blessing for evermore." In Ezek. xxxvii. 26, 28, he also promised to set his sanctuary in the midst of Israel "for evermore." And in Psalm xxxvii. 27, David says, "depart from evil and do good, and dwell for evermore." And in lxxxvi. 12, says, "I will glorify thy name for evermore." The only other text in which *olim* is rendered for evermore, is Psalm cvi. 31, and is thus explained. Speaking of Phineas, it is said, that what he did "was counted unto him for righteousness, unto all generations for ever more." Here *all generations* and *for evermore* are used as equivalent expressions for the same thing. On the whole of

these texts we remark, that *evermore* is applied to things which never were intended to continue to endless duration. Such were Solomon's throne, and God's sanctuary among the children of Israel. A long period may be meant, but not surely a proper eternity. Even when evermore is applied to God, we cannot conclude that it signifies endless duration; for it is explained to mean, "all generations." In none of these texts is *evermore* applied to punishment. No further notice need then be taken of them here, as any further remarks will be more in place afterwards.

4th. *Olim* is rendered *forever*, in the following places, and expresses the duration of a man's lifetime, or even a shorter period. Thus it is said, Deut. xv. 17, "thou shalt take an awl and thrust it through his ear unto the door, and he shall be thy servant forever." Now, this could only mean all the servant's lifetime, or, perhaps to the year of jubilee. It could not be beyond his life, for at death the servant is free from his master. The same thing is said Exod. xxi. 6. But again, we find Samuel's mother saying, 1 Sam. i. 22, "I will not go up until the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and abide there forever." Here, forever can mean no more than all the days of Samuel's life. Again; Jonadab commanded his children that they should drink "no more wine forever." Jer. xxxv. 6. Does not this simply mean, all their days, or at furthest, throughout their generation? And is not something similar meant, when Achish said of David, 1 Sam. xxvii. 12, "he shall be my servant forever?" And also Levit. xxv. 46, where it is said, strangers shall be to Israel "bondmen forever." And 2 Kings v. 27, it is said, that the leprosy was to cleave to ~~Naaman~~ Gehazi "forever." But who ever thought this man was to be a leper to

the endlesss ages of eternity? In Job xli. 4, speaking of leviathan, it is said, "wilt thou take him for a servant forever." There is one text which deserves particular notice, because it is the first time in which the word *olim* is used in the Bible, and is rendered forever. Thus it is said, Gen. iii. 22, "and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever," therefore God drove forth the man from the garden. On this text let us hear Dr. Kennicot, the great Hebrew scholar of his day. He says, dissert. i. p. 83, "A third objection may be made to the rendering of the word *lolim*, in chap. iii. 22—that it is made to signify *the days of Adam's life only*, and not *forever*. In answer to this, I observe that the word *oulim* is used as often, perhaps, finitely as infinitely; and that it can signify nothing more than the age or life of man, in places where our translators have frequently rendered it *forever*. Thus Exod. xxi. 6—'Then his master shall bring him unto the judges, and he shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever.' And 1 Sam. i. 22, 'but Hannah went not up; for she said, I will not go up until the child be weaned; and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and there abide forever.'" But further, we find Bathsheba says, 1 Kings i. 31, "Let my lord king David live forever." And in Neh. ii. 3, he says to king Artaxerxes, "Let the king live forever." See the same or similar language, Dan. ii. 4; iii. 9; v. 10, and vi. 6, 21. All meant in these texts is, let the king's life be long, or the years of his life be many. The persons never supposed that kings could live to the endless ages of eternity. In Exod. xiv. 13, it is said to Israel, that the Egyptians whom they saw to-day, they should see "no more forever." No more can be meant, than

that they should not see them again, and the reason is obvious, for they were all to be drowned in the sea.

In the following texts we find certain places are said to be forever, which cannot mean that they shall continue to endless duration. In Eccles. i. 4, it is said, "the earth abideth forever." And Psalm civ. 5, "who laid the foundations of the earth, that they should not be removed forever." And Psalm lxxviii. 69. "He built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established forever." God is said to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed, that they should dwell in it forever; and David be their prince forever. See Ezek. xxxvii. 25. In all the following texts the land of Canaan is expressly said to be forever to Abraham and his seed. See Gen. xiii. 15; Exod. xxxii. 13; 1 Chron. xxviii. 8; 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isai. lx. 21; Josh. xiv. 9. This last text refers to that part of the land given to Caleb, which was to be his, and his children's forever. And are not some lands deeded away forever now in a similar sense?—Israel is commanded, not to seek the peace, nor the wealth of the inhabitants of Canaan forever, Ezra ix. 12. In Deut. xxiii. 6, we have the same injunction repeated, and it is added, "all thy days forever."—Here *all thy days* and *forever* are used to express the same period of time, and simply mean throughout the generations of Israel. Is was a sign between the Lord and Israel forever, that in six days God made heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh, Exod. xxxi. 17. The children of Israel dwelling in Canaan, or inheriting it forever, is contrary to fact. For nearly two thousand years the Jews have been cast out of it, and should they return to-day, and dwell in it as long as this earth shall continue, yet unless the world is to be of endless duration, forever does not express an infinite

period of time. It is further said, 1 Chron. xxiii. 25, the Lord God of Israel hath given rest unto his people, that they may dwell in Jerusalem forever." And in Jer. xvii. 25, it is said, "and this city shall remain forever." And referring to it, David says, Psalm xlviii. 8, "God will establish it forever." And in Jer. xxxi. 40, it is said, "it shall not be plucked up, nor thrown down any more forever." And in Psalm cxxv. 1, it is said, "they that trust in the Lord shall be like mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth forever." And referring to the temple, Solomon says, 1 Kings viii. 13. "I have surely built thee a house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in forever." For substance repeated, 2 Chron. vi. 2. And in 2 Chron. xxx. 8, it is said to be "sanctified forever." But what is meant by Jerusalem remaining "forever," is explained thus, Joel iii. 20, "but Judah shall dwell forever, and *Jerusalem from generation to generation.*" Again, Josh. viii. 28, it is said, "Joshua burnt Ai and made it an heap forever." It is added, by way of explanation, "even a desolation unto this day." And of Babylon it is said, Isai. xlvii. 7, "I shall be a lady forever." But God says concerning this city, Jer. li. 26, "thou shalt be desolate forever." And verse 62, it is added, "none shall remain in it, neither man or beast, but it shall be desolate forever." Of Hazor and other cities it is said, they "shall be a dwelling for dragons, and a desolation forever: there shall no man abide there, nor any son of man dwell in it," Jer. xlix. 33. And of another place it is said, "the smoke thereof shall go up forever," and that the wild beasts "shall possess it forever," Isai, xxxiv. 14, 17. The explanation of forever in the last text is given thus: "from generation to generation it shall lie waste," and "from generation to generation wild beasts shall dwell

therein." See verses 8—17. In Psalm xlix. 11, it is said, that the inward thought of the wicked is, that their houses shall continue "forever." But the explanation given is—"and their dwelling-places to all generations."

The word *olim* is rendered forever, and applied in a variety of ways to the laws and ordinances of the Mosaic dispensation. It was a statute "forever throughout their generations," that they should not sacrifice their children to devils, Levit. xvii. 7. Nor eat of the fruits of the land, until they had brought a part of it unto the Lord, Levit. xxiii. 14. It was an ordinance forever throughout their generations, that the stranger and the children of Israel were to be alike in offering certain offerings to the Lord, Num. xv. 15 and xix. 10. It was also a statute "forever unto their generations," that Aaron and his sons should enjoy certain things, and perform certain parts of service, Exod. xxvii. 21; Levit. xxiv. 3; Exod. xxviii. 43; xxix. 28, and xxx. 21; Levit. vi. 18, 22; vii. 34, 36, and x. 9, 15; Numb. x. 8, and xviii. 8, 11, 19, 23; 1 Chron. xv. 2, and xxiii. 13; 2 Chron. ii. 4; Exod. xii. 14; comp. verses 17, 24; Levit. xxiii. 41; Comp. verses 33—41; Levit. xvi. 31; Comp. verse 29, and xxiii. 31. The laws and ordinances enjoined in these texts, all relate to the old dispensation, which has vanished away. But all must see, they were to be observed "forever," and the fact shows that endless duration could not possibly be meant by this expression. The children of Israel were a peculiar people, separated from all other nations, and for certain important purposes, which would be aside from our present purpose to detail.—Such laws and ordinances were to be observed by them "forever," and this forever was as long as they existed as a nation, and until the purposes of God were an-

swered by them. Hence "in your generations," and "throughout your generations," or some similar explanatory expression is used. Both seem to express, the continued practice of those laws and ordinances, but not the endless duration of their observance. This law was added because of transgression "till the seed should come." In the hope of the promise of the Messiah being fulfilled, the twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hoped to come. When Christ had fulfilled all that was written of him, it was virtually abolished, and Paul declared in his day, it had waxed old and was ready to vanish away. The "forever" was bounded by this period, and this was even a longer forever than some others spoken of in Scripture.

In the following texts, *forever* seems to express a long, indefinite period of time, but not endless duration. In Exod. xix. 9, the reason given for God's speaking to Moses in a cloud is, that the people might believe him "forever." But does forever mean any thing more, than that Moses might be believed by all the future generations of Israel. It is also said, Ezek. xliii. 7, that God is to dwell in the midst of Israel "forever." But can this signify to endless duration? Can it mean any thing more than what is said so often by way of explanation, "from generation to generation," or throughout their generations? See also verse 9. David says of God's commandments, that they were "ever with him," Psalm cxix. 98. But does this mean any thing more than a continuance in them? But further, had Saul obeyed the Lord, Samuel told him that the Lord would have established his kingdom upon Israel "forever," 1 Sam. xiii. 13. But I ask every candid man, did not Samuel mean that the kingdom would have been hereditary in Saul's family, or as the Scriptures say, he should not have wanted "a man to

sit on the throne?" David, on whom Saul's kingdom was bestowed, says, that God chose him before all the house of his father "to be a king over Israel forever," 1 Chron. xxviii. 4. But did David mean, that he and his seed should sit to endless duration on a throne in Israel? Is not the meaning simply this—that the kingdom should be hereditary in his family so long as Israel existed as a nation? We think this is evident from 2 Chron. xiii. 5, where it is said, "ought ye not to know, that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons by a covenant of salt?" Comp. 2 Chron. ix. 8. Besides, notice what is said, Psalm lxxxix. 4, in confirmation of this, and in explanation of the meaning of the phrase "forever." It is said, "thy seed will I establish forever;" but it is added, "and build up thy throne to all generations." All generations is surely not endless duration! Admitting that this ultimately referred to the Messiah, who was to be of the seed of David, yet it was understood of David's descendants. This seems evident from similar things being said of Solomon. See 1 Chron. xvii. 23; 1 Kings ii. 45; 2 Sam. vii. 13, 16, 25; 1 Chron. xxii. 10, and xxviii. 7, which I need not transcribe. It is also evident from the intrigues and attempts of David's sons and others to usurp the throne. The same is said of the Messiah, Isai. ix. 7, "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." But even when forever is applied to him, we doubt if this expresses the endless duration of his reign, but simply expresses that it shall never give place to any other in this world. One or two of our reasons for thinking so we shall only here state.

1st. If "forever," and "no end," in this passage, means endless duration, it must be allowed that this world must also continue to endless duration. Is it asked how I make this appear? I answer, that it is plainly said, that of the *increase* of his government there shall be no end. But how is this to take place if this world is to end? The increase of his government takes place in this world, nor does any one refer its increase to a period after it ends. Either then this world has no end, but shall continue to afford an increase of subjects to Messiah's kingdom, or forever, and no end, here do not mean endless duration. We never heard of any increase of subjects to Christ's kingdom but while this world continued.

2d. Christ's kingdom, or his reign, is represented like the duration of the sun or the host of heaven.—Psalm lxxii. is allowed to refer to him. In verse 19, it is said, and blessed be his glorious name. And in verse 17 we find it said, his name shall endure forever. If we ask, how long a time this forever is, we find it answered thus—his name shall be continued as long as the sun. Again it is said, Psalm lxxxix. 29, his seed also will I make to endure forever. But it is added—and his throne as the days of heaven. And in verses 36, 37, we find it said—his seed shall endure forever, but it is again subjoined by way of explanation—And his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon. We think these texts limit the meaning of forever to the duration of the sun and moon, and the Messiah's reign also to this period. This seems to be in agreement with what is said 1 Cor. xv. 24—29, that when Christ hath subdued all things, he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the father, that he may be all in all. This period is called the end and succeeds the resurrection of the dead.

I am aware that it may be objected—"if forever is thus limited to the end of this world, will it not follow that Christ's seed must end, for they are said to endure forever, which according to this view is only as long as the sun and moon endureth?" I answer, that this does not follow, for Christ at this period is to deliver up the kingdom to God the father and surely this kingdom includes the subjects or Christ's seed. If delivered up to God, no one thinks that this is for the purpose of being annihilated, or to suffer endless punishment.

But further, David prays, that his house might continue blessed before God "forever." 2 Sam. vii. 29; 1 Chron. xvii. 27. God promised to establish the throne of Solomon forever, 1 Kings ix. 5. David declares himself guiltless before the Lord forever from the blood of Abner, 2 Sam. iii. 28; Comp. 1 Kings ii. 23. His kindness was not to be cut off from the house of Jonathan forever, 1 Sam. xx. 15; Comp. verse 42.—But could any thing more be meant by forever, than so long as his house existed? Israel was to be unto God a people forever, 2 Sam. vii. 24. See also 1 Chron. xvii. 22. Things revealed, belonged to them and their children forever, Deut. xxix. 29. And if they obeyed God, it should go well with them and their children forever, Deut. xii. 28, and by so doing, they would leave the land unto their children for an inheritance forever, Ezra ix. 12. And if they did not obey the Lord, the curses in the law should be upon them for a sign and for a wonder forever, Deut. xxviii. 46. Again; an Ammonite or Moabite was not to enter into the congregation of the Lord forever; and this is explained to be, to the tenth generation, Deut. xxiii. 3; Nehem. xiii. 1. The stones set up at Jordan, were to be a memorial unto the children of Israel forever, Josh. iv. 7. But did any man ever think that these stones

were to stand there to the endless ages of eternity? If we understand forever to mean, as often explained, from generation to generation, or throughout the generations of Israel, no difficulty is perceived; but to understand it of endless duration, is absurd. Again; the Lord had said that the house of Eli should walk before him forever, 1 Sam. ii. 30. But his conduct and that of his sons was such, that God says, 1 Sam. iii. 13, 14, "I will judge his house forever." And that "the iniquity of his house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor burnt offerings forever." Some may think that their sins were unpardonable. No; what seems simply meant, is, that no sacrifice or burnt offering could avail, so as to preserve the priesthood in Eli's family. Again; Israel is commanded to hope in the Lord forever, Psalm cxxxi. 3. And in cxxv. 2, the Lord is said to be round about them forever; and xxviii. 9.—David prays that God would lift up his people forever. And in 1 Chron. xxix. 18, that he would keep what is right in their hearts forever. And Psalm xii. 7, that he would preserve them from this generation forever. And xxxvii. 18 says, that the inheritance of the righteous shall be forever. And verse 28, that they are preserved forever. And xli. 12, that God set him before his face forever. And lxxiii. 26, that God was his portion forever. And it is said, Isai. xxxii. 17, that the effect of righteousness was to be "quietness and assurance forever." In Psalm xxx. 12, David says, "I will give thanks unto thee forever." And in xliv. 8, that he would "praise God's name forever." See also lii. 9. In lxxix. 13, he says, "we will give thee thanks forever," but adds, as an explanation, "we will show forth thy praise to all generations."—And lxxv. 9, he says, "I will declare forever," and explains himself thus—"I will sing praises to the God

of Jacob." But further, in Psalm cxii. 6, David says, a good man "shall not be moved forever." In cxix. 111, that he had taken God's testimonies "as an heritage forever." And verse 152, "that God had founded them forever." In Psalm v. 11, he says, "let them that put their trust in the Lord ever shout for joy."—Psalm lxi. 4, David says, "I will abide in thy tabernacle forever." And God says, Hosea ii. 19, "I will betroth thee unto me forever." Psalm xlv. 2, and probably speaking of the Messiah, it is said, "God hath blessed thee forever." And in Isai. lix. 21, it is declared, that God's word was not to depart from him nor his seed "forever." And Psalm lxi. 7, that he shall abide before God "forever." But comparing verse 6 forever is explained thus—"thou wilt prolong the king's life; and his years as many generations." In the margin it is "as generation and generation."—Comp. Psalm lxxxix. 36, 37, and 1 Chron. xvii. 14. In 1 Kings x. 9, it is said, God "loved Israel forever." And in Deut. v. 29, that by "obeying him it would be well with them and their children forever." But again, speaking of God's temporal judgments, it is said, Joel ii. 2, to be a day "there hath not been ever the like." And of the dead it is said, Eccles. ix. 6, that they have no more a portion "forever" in any thing done under the sun. Speaking of the descendants of Esau, it is said, Obad. 10, that they shall be cut off *forever*. Jonah says, ii. 6, that the bars of the earth were about him *forever*. In Zach. i. 5, the question is asked concerning the prophets, Do they live *forever*? If forever is asserted to mean endless duration, it is here strongly implied that the prophets do not live forever. But the question here simply means, do the prophets live to all generations. It is said of some, Psalm lxxxi. 15, that "their time should have endured

forever." And Solomon, Eccles. ii. 16, says—"There is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool forever." And David says, Psalm xlix. 8, "the redemption of the soul, or the natural life from death, it ceaseth forever." And in Prov. xxvii. 24, it is said of riches—"they are not forever;" but the common explanation is added—"And doth the crown endure to every generation."

But I find *olim* rendered *forever, applied to God* in a variety of ways. These texts demand the closest attention, for it is in consequence of this, that it is considered as expressing endless duration. Can it mean any thing less than this, say some, seeing it is applied to *him* who had no beginning, and who shall have no end? This may be true, but it ought not to be admitted without sufficient evidence, seeing this same word is applied to so many things which all allow are not of endless duration, We shall therefore give this part of the subject all the care and attention we can command. *Olim*, then, is rendered forever and applied

To the existence of God. Thus in Deut. xxxii. 40, God says, "I live forever." And in Psalm ix. 7, "The Lord shall endure forever." And cii. 12, "thou, O Lord, shalt endure forever," but observe, it is added, by way of explanation, "and thy remembrance unto all generations." In Lam. v. 19, it is said, "thou, O Lord, remainest forever;" but the common explanation is again given, for it is added, "and thy throne from generation to generation." And it is said, Eccles. iii. 14, That "whatsoever God doeth it shall be forever." It is also applied *to his name or character in general.* Thus it is said, Exod. iii. 15, "This is my name forever," and explained thus, "and this is my memorial unto all generations." His character, name or glory,

are the same. Hence it is said, Psalm civ. 31, "the glory of the Lord shall endure forever." And Mic. ii. 9, God complains that his glory was taken away from some "forever." In 2 Sam. vii. 26, it is said, "let thy name be magnified forever:" and is repeated 1 Chron. xvii. 24. In Psalm cxxxv. 13, it is said, "thy name, O Lord, endureth forever;" but observe it is added again as an explanation, "and thy memorial, O Lord, throughout all generations." In the margin "to generation and generation." In all the following passages, which I need not transcribe, God is spoken of as putting his name in his house "forever." 1 Kings ix. 3; 2 Chron. vii. 16; 2 Kings xxi. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 4, 7. But to proceed, we find *forever applied to his truth.* Thus it is said, Psalm cxvii. 2, "The truth of the Lord endureth forever." And in Psalm cxlvi. 6, "that he keepeth truth forever." An in Isai. xl. 8, "the word of God shall stand forever." It is also applied *to his faithfulness.* Accordingly, it is said, Psalm cv. 8, "He hath remembered his covenant forever." What follows by way of explanation deserves particular notice; "The word which he commanded to a thousand generations." A thousand generations is a long period of time, but it is not eternity. Again, it is said, Psalm cxi. 9, "He hath commanded his covenant forever." And verse 5, "He will ever be mindful of his covenant." It is also applied *to his reign and power.* Thus it is said, Psalm lxvi. 7, "He ruleth by his power forever." And xxix. 10, "The Lord sitteth king forever." In Mic. iv. 7, it is said of Israel, "The Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth even forever." And Psalm cxlvi. 10, "The Lord shall reign forever, even thy God, O Zion." But here again the common explanation is given, "unto all generations." Also *to his*

wisdom or counsel. In Psalm xxxiii. 11, "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever." But it is said, by way of explanation, "the thought of his heart to all generations." And *to his righteousness or salvation.* Thus it is said, Isai. li. 6, "my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished." Now compare with this, verse 8, "my righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation;" does not "from generation to generation" here express precisely what is meant by "forever?"

But I find the word *olim* rendered "*forever*" *and applied to God's mercy.* The expression, *for his mercy endureth forever*, is found once in each of the following texts: 2 Chron. v. 13; xx. 21; Ezra iii. 11; Psalm cvi. 1; cvii. 1; cxxxviii. 8; Jer. xxxiii. 11. In each of the following places it occurs twice. 2 Chron. vii. 3, 6; 1 Chron. xvi. 34, 41. In Psalm cxviii. 1—4, 29, it is found five times. And in Psalm cxxxvi. it occurs no less than twenty-six times. The expression "for his mercy endureth forever," is found then forty-two times in the Old Testament. The reason for being so particular in thus numbering the places will appear presently. Although the following texts do not contain this precise expression, yet it is evident they have an affinity to the present topic. I shall therefore introduce them here, before I proceed to make any remarks on the above expression. David says, Psalm lxxxix. 1, "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever," and explains it by adding, "with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations." And well he might, for he says, verse 2, "Mercy shall be built up forever." And again explains his meaning by saying, "thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens." Observe, that in the first of these verses forever is explained in the mar-

gin "to generation and generation." In the second by his faithfulness being established in the very heavens seems to be meant, that it should endure as the heavens or throughout all generations. Besides, David says, Psalm c. 5, "For the Lord is good; his mercy is everlasting," and adds, by way of explanation, "and his truth endureth to all generations." He adds, Psalm ciii. 17, "But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him," and it is again added, "and his righteousness unto children's children."

On all these texts where it is said, "for his mercy endureth forever," with others of a similar nature, I shall now make a few observations. 1st. It is very evident, that the mercy of God formed the burden of song to the Jews in their worship. The God of the Jews was a merciful God, slow to anger, and of great kindness. 2d. If it be true, as our orthodox friends assert, that God is as much glorified in the display of his endless wrath against the wicked, as in the display of his endless mercy towards the righteous, how do they account for it, that the phrase "for his wrath endureth forever" does not occur forty-two times as well as the phrase "for his mercy endureth forever?" Why have we not a Psalm, in which it is twenty-six times said, "O give thanks unto the Lord for he is good, for his wrath endureth forever." Nor do we see what objection they could have to singing it, if God is as much glorified by the one as by the other. But supposing such a Psalm found in the Bible, and that they should sing both, would they not celebrate the endless mercy and wrath of the same God towards his own creatures? But I ask, how all this could be reconciled with God's declarations, that mercy rejoiceth against judgment, and that his tender mercies are over his other works.

But 3d. we would candidly ask our orthodox brethren, how they account for the extraordinary fact, *that it is not once said that "the wrath of the Lord endureth forever?"* so far from this being once asserted, it is repeatedly and expressly denied that God's wrath endureth forever. Thus it is said, Psalm ciii. 9, "He will not always chide; neither will he keep his anger forever." Again, Isai. lvii. 16, "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me and the souls which I have madv." No, say our orthodox friends, they shall not fail, but shall endure the endless wrath of God. But it is again said, Jer. iii. 5, "Will he reserve his anger forever? Will he keep it to the end? Here it is supposed that forever is to end, and hence it is said, verse 12, "for I am merciful saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger forever. And in Lam. iii. 31, it is expressly said, "the Lord will not cast off forever."—Further, David says, Psalm lxxxv. 5, "Wilt thou be angry with us forever?" but he adds, by way of explanation, "wilt thou draw out thine anger to all generations?" And Psalm lxxvii. 8, says, "is his mercy clean gone forever? Doth his promise fail for evermore?" Notice here, that as forever and for evermore are expressions which convey to an English reader the same idea, so did the original word *olim* to the sacred writers. This appears also from other passages. It is beyond debate, that it is never once said, that the anger, or wrath of God endureth forever. We solemnly call on any man to produce a single instance where this is said. By what authority then do men in our day preach that God's wrath is to endure forever? Is it like men who reverence the sacred oracles, to speak of the everlasting anger and eternal wrath of God, yet can produce no example from them of such modes of

speaking? Yea, I ask every candid man if it is possible to select words, which could more clearly and emphatically deny that God's wrath endureth forever, than is done in the above passages? Granting then, for argument's sake, that *olim* rendered forever, expresses endless duration, and that God's wrath or anger means punishment, no language could more definitely declare, that punishment is not of endless duration. Were I contending for a victory over the believers in endless punishment, it would be good policy in me to allow, that *olim*, rendered forever, expresses this, and the above texts would be direct positive proof, that it is not of endless duration. Our orthodox friends in contending for this must perceive, that their doctrine of endless punishment is overturned from its base by the above passages. But I disclaim any contention for victory. My object is to examine what is truth, and embrace it whatever it may be, for this only can stand, or be of any real benefit to the human race. 4th! But granting, for the sake of argument, that God's wrath was as much celebrated in the Bible as his mercy, and that the endless duration of it was as often asserted, permit me to ask, what worse could be sung of an Eastern despot, or of the devil, allowing such a fallen angel to exist? We seriously urge our brethren, who believe such a doctrine, to consider if such a God can appear to any person very lovely, or is likely to be loved. None can love him, but those who can persuade themselves that they are his particular favorites. Even this may be doubted, for a being of this character may turn their enemy to-morrow, and display his endless wrath upon them. All the apparent love and obedience which they pretend to pay him, it is to be feared, arises more from terror of, than love to him; and if a song of endless mercy and endless wrath are

both alike orthodox, orthodoxy must be a very singular kind of thing.

To get rid of these and other serious difficulties which might be urged, it may be said, "in all the above texts where it is denied that God's wrath endureth forever, the writers are not speaking of God's wrath in a future state of existence, but only in the present life." Well, how does this relieve the difficulties, unless it is proved from some other texts, that God says his wrath shall endure forever in a future state of existence? But can this be proved? No: this very attempt to escape from the difficulties, only shows the impossibility of making any escape, for if the above texts wholly refer to the present life, how happens it that they are the only texts where *forever* and the wrath of God are associated, and in them it is expressly denied that his wrath does endure forever? If denied in them, and found in no other, it settles the question, that God's wrath does not endure throughout all generations, far less in an eternal state of existence. But is it not rather silly to make the inspired writers say, that God's wrath does not endure forever in the present life, yet contend for this in a future state without any Scripture authority? Who needed to be told that God's punishment of men in this world was not of endless duration?

5th. We come now to those texts in which *olim* is repeated, and is rendered "forever and ever." I find then, that *forever and ever* is used and applied to the following things, in the following ways. David says, Psalm cxix. 44, I shall keep thy law continually, forever and ever. And in Mic. iv. 5, We will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever. And Dan. xii. 3, They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever. And David says of God's judgments, that—"they stand fast forever

and ever." Psalm cxi. 8. What is meant by this forever and ever, and whether it was intended to express endless duration may be learned from the following texts. In Jer. vii. 7, if Israel amended their ways, then said God, "will I cause you to dwell in this place in the land that I gave to your fathers forever and ever." It is very evident, that if forever and ever expresses endless duration of time, on the above consideration Israel were to dwell in Judea time without end. But who ever entertained such an idea? Is not the meaning evidently from generation to generation, or throughout all generations, while they continued a nation?—Again it is said, Isai. xxx. 8, "Now go write it in a book, that it may be for the time to come, forever and ever." The forever and ever here, is called *the time to come*, which time appears to be not endless duration, but simply the future generations of Israel. See the context. If time to come be a proper explanation of forever, it cannot refer to eternity unless we think eternity *time*. But is not time always distinguished from eternity? What is meant by forever and ever, seems plainly stated in Psalm cxlviii. 5, 6, speaking of the host of heaven, it is said, "he commanded, and they were created. He hath also established them forever and ever." But is the host of heaven, or the sun, moon, and stars. to continue to endless duration? This must be maintained, or we must give up the idea that forever and ever expresses a proper eternity. We have seen above, that forever is applied to the host of heaven, and from the very nature of the case, forever and ever here cannot express a longer period of time. Both seem to be limited by the duration of this world. Again, God speaking, Isai. xxxiv. 10, of his temporal judgments on all nations, particularly on Idumea, says, in highly figurative language, "the land thereof shall

become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever." Compare verse 17. Let it be noticed on this text, that forever, and forever and ever, mean the same duration of time, and both these are explained by the phrase "from generation to generation."

But I find *olim* repeated, and rendered forever and ever, and applied to God, in the following places:— *In ascriptions of praise to him.* Thus it is said, "Blessed be thou, Lord God of Israel, our father, forever and ever." 1 Chron. xxix. 10. The same for substance is repeated in chap. xvi. 36, and Neh. ix. 5. And in Psalm cxlv. 1, it is said, "I will bless thy name forever and ever;" and verse 2, "I will praise thy name for ever and ever;" and verse 21, "Let all flesh bless his holy name forever and ever." It is also applied to *the existence of God.* Thus in Dan. xii. 7, the man clothed in linen "sware by him that liveth forever and ever." And David says, Psalm xlviii. 14, "For this God is our God forever and ever." Also to *God's reign.* Accordingly it is said, Exod. xv. 18, "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever." And in Psalm x. 16, it is said. "The Lord is king forever and ever." And in Psalm xlv. 6, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." Also to *the mercy of God.*— Thus it is said, Psalm lii. 8, "I trust in the mercy of God forever and ever." It seems also to be applied *to the Messiah:* "He asked life of thee and thou gavest it him, even length of days forever and ever," Psalm xxi. 4. And xlv. 17, "I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations: therefore shall the people praise thee forever and ever." Now suffer me to ask here—Does not the phrase, all genera-

tions, in the first part of this verse, explain, or express the very same thing as forever and ever, in the last part, and is it not in unison with the common explanation so often given above, where *olim* is rendered forever?

In looking back on all the texts introduced in these two Sections, let the reader notice the following things. All the texts in the first show that the word *olim* expresses limited duration, and was so understood by our translators, for they render it by English words which do not convey the idea of endless duration. Again, the greater part of the passages in both Sections show, that the word *olim*, in whatever way rendered, was applied by the sacred writers to things of temporary duration. This, we think, is indisputable. Again, it has been seen that *olim*, whether applied to temporary things or to God, is explained by the inspired writers to mean *throughout all generations*, or by some similar expression. Why give such explanations at all, if the word means *endless duration*? And why were they given, when God is spoken of, as well as when it expresses the duration of any thing else, if it expresses his endless duration? But again: in none of the above passages is the word *olim* used to express the duration of punishment to the wicked. All the texts where it is supposed to be used to express this, will be considered in the next Section.—The long detail of texts in the two preceding Sections, perhaps, may appear dry and uninteresting to some readers; but it was absolutely necessary to pursue this course to come at a full and fair understanding of the Scriptural meaning and general usage of the word *olim*, so variously rendered in the common version.

SECTION III.

ALL THE TEXTS WHERE OLIM OCCURS, AND IS RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH CONVEY THE IDEA OF ENDLESS DURATION, AND APPLIED TO PUNISHMENT, PARTICULARLY CONSIDERED.

In the preceding Section, we have seen the term *olim*, rendered perpetual, everlasting, and forever, and used to express the duration of the punishment of certain *places*, Isai. xxxiv. 9—17, and Jer. xlix. 13.—We are now to bring into view the texts where it is used to express the punishment of *persons*, in whatever way it is rendered in the common verson. Jer. xxiii. 39, 40, is the first we shall notice. "Therefore I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence: and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten." Comp. Jer. xx. 11. It has been shown, in the Inquiry into the words, Sheol, Hades, &c., that this passage refers to the punishment of the Jewish nation, and deserves no further notice here. See on 2 Thess. chap. i., below, and on Matt. chaps. xxiv., xxv. Indeed, few will question this.

Jer. xvii. 4. "For ye have kindled a fire in mine anger, which shall burn forever." It is so evident. from verses 1—4, the prophet is speaking of the sin and punishment of Judah, and this punishment was

of a temporal nature, that it would be a waste of time to offer any remarks on this passage.

Isai. xxxiii. 14. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites: who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" Having considered this passage in my Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c., to it I refer the reader for an illustration.

Psalm ix. 5. "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name forever and ever." It would be useless to spend time in showing, that this text has no reference to punishment in a future state. No sensible orthodox man would urge it, and no man who consults the context, can help seeing that it has no reference to such a a subject.

Mal. i. 4. "Whereas Edom saith, we are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of hosts, they shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them the border of wickedness, and the people against whom the Lord hath indignation forever." The prophet is here speaking of Edom, and it is plain from the context, that the indignation mentioned, is not in a future state, but God's temporal vengeance on that people. The meaning of the passage evidently is, "the people against whom the Lord hath indignation from generation to generation," as explained frequently in preceding Sections.

Dan. xii. 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The principal question to be considered from this passage is—Did Daniel here speak of the everlasting punish-

ment of the wicked? If he did, he delivered it in plainer language than any other sacred writer, and in a book which contains predictions clothed in highly figurative language. Our orthodox friends do not depend much on the Old Testament for proof of the doctrine of endless misery, and as this is the strongest, yea, I may say the only text which they generally quote from it in proof, we shall give it a particular consideration.

The passage then says—"And at that time." At what time? The time evidently, of which Daniel had been speaking, chap. xi. This will not be disputed, for it is plain that the first four verses of chap. xii, connect with the matters stated in the 11th chapter. The things mentioned are said to take place at the period called *that time*, chap. xii. 1, whatever time this may be. This time, is easily ascertained, from considering of what people Daniel was speaking. It is plain he referred to the Jews, for in verse 1, they are twice called "thy people," or Daniel's people, who certainly were Jews. Let us then see how the events mentioned agree to Daniel's people. It is said, "and at that time," which time is called, chap. xii. 40, "the time of the end." But this provokes the question—What end? I answer, the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. Is it asked, what proof have we of this? I answer, in chap. xi. verse 31, "*the abomination that maketh desolate*" is expressly mentioned, which passage our Lord quotes, Matth. xxiv. 15, and applies it to the Romans, by whom the Jewish temple and city were destroyed at the end of the age. See the whole of chap. xi, for other circumstances which corroborate this. It will be shown afterwards, that the period called "the end," chap. xi, and "that time," chap. xii. 1, exactly agree to the end of the Jewish dispensation,

which is repeatedly called "the end of the world," or age, in the New Testament. It is then said, at that time "*shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people.*" It is difficult to say with certainty, who was referred to by Michael, nor is this necessary to be determined in the present discussion. The most probable opinion we have seen is, that Michael, the great prince, refers to Messiah, called the prince of the Jews in other parts of the book of Daniel, and the prince of life, and prince of the kings of the earth, in other parts of Scripture. It is supposed by Pierce and others, that certain angels presided over different parts of the world before the coming of Christ, but all of them now are put in subjection to him. During the period which preceded his coming, it is supposed he was the person who presided over the Jewish nation. But it would be aside from my present object to enter further into this question.

The passage proceeds to say—"And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time." Our Lord refers to these very words, Matt. xxiv. 21, and applies them to the great tribulations which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple at the end of the age. "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved." Who can doubt, after reading this, that Daniel referred to the end of the age, and the tribulations which came on the Jewish nation? He could refer to no other, unless it can be proved, that there have been two different times of such calamity, that the like had never been since there was a nation, or from the beginning

of the world. We think this conclusively shows to what period, to what people, and to what calamities the prophet referred.

It is further said—"And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." It is not said, all Daniel's people shall be delivered "*at that time*," but only such as were found "*written in the book*." What is meant by being blotted out of a book, or not found written in it, we may learn from Exodus. xxxii. 32, 33, and compare Rev. xx. 15. On the contrary, what is meant by being found written in a book, may be learned from Phil. iv. 3, and Rev. xiii. 8. Compare Isai. iv. 3, and Luke x. 20. I shall only quote the following passages, which are a sufficient illustration of this phraseology. "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous," Psalm lxix. 28. By consulting this Psalm any one may see David referred to the unbelieving Jews, who were the murderers of our Lord, for it is quoted in the New Testament and applied to them. It is implied, that the righteous are written in a book, and it is evident, also, that to be blotted out "of the book of the living," or "not to be written with the righteous," are synonymous expressions. Who, then, were the righteous, written in the book, distinguished from the unbelieving Jews not written with the righteous? What persons could they be but our Lord's disciples? This, in the first place, agrees to the fact, for they were all delivered from the calamities which came on the Jewish nation at the end of the age. They left the city according to our Lord's directions, Matt. xxiv., and went to a city called Pella, as shown by Macknight on that chapter. Second, It is in agreement with the prediction of Malachi, and the language

he uses in reference both to Christ's disciples and also, the unbelieving Jews. Concerning the former, "a book of remembrance was written," chap. iii. 16, and they were spared as a man spareth his only son which serveth him. Concerning the latter, they were to be as stubble. See the description given of them at length in Malachi, chaps. iii. iv. The peculiar phraseology about being written in a book, is in allusion to the ancient practice of making record at courts, of any good service any one had done, as may be seen by consulting Esther vi. 1, 2, and ii. 23.—This part of the passage, then, perfectly agrees with Scripture, and with the facts of the case.

Let us now attend to verse 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." That no literal resurrection of the dead took place at the destruction of Jerusalem needs no proof, and it has been shown that Daniel refers to this period. What then is the prophet's meaning?—The phrase "everlasting life" occurs no where else in the Old Testament. It is a phrase familiar to the New Testament writers, and if borrowed from the Old, must have been taken from this place in Daniel. It could not refer to the happiness of heaven, as people generally suppose, but to that life of happiness enjoyed by the disciples of our Lord, who were found written in the book, as the time and events mentioned verse 1, show. Besides, it is set in contrast to the shame and everlasting contempt suffered by those not found written in the book, and which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple, and which they are still as a nation enduring. It is obvious, that in Scripture style, life is used to express glory, honor, and happiness, as could easily be shown.—

At the period referred to, verse 1, many awoke to the honor and happiness of our Lord's kingdom, or reign, which consists in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the holy spirit. So did many to the shame and contempt which came on the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation. The term everlasting is applied to both, and can occasion no difficulty to any one, who has attended to the Old Testament usage of this word, as shown in the preceding Sections. It is objected,—"How could any believer enjoy everlasting life, or any one endure shame and everlasting contempt, if these are confined to this world? Must not both be carried into another world to be everlasting?" We answer this by asking,—Must not the children of Israel and the land of Canaan, then, be carried into a future state, that they may enjoy this land for "an everlasting possession?" And must not the servant whose ear was pierced, go into another world if he would serve his master forever? And must not Aaron and his sons, with the whole Levitical service, go into another world, that they may enjoy the priesthood forever? In fact, instances without number may be adduced, to show the absurdity of such an objection, and of such a mode of reasoning on the word everlasting.

It is agreeable to fact, that on the day of Pentecost three thousand Jews awoke to the everlasting life imparted by the gospel, by believing in Jesus. Such also was the case with multitudes, as the history of the acts of the Apostles shows. Though the spirit of slumber had seized the Jewish nation, though they had eyes, and saw not, and ears, but heard not, yet the apostle declares that there was a remnant according to the election of grace. See Rom. xi. This part awoke to everlasting life, or entered into the everlast-

ing kingdom of Christ, and had peace and joy in believing. They heard the voice of the Son of God and lived. Compare Eph. v. 14. The rest slept on till the wrath of God came upon them to the uttermost. They awoke, but it was to shame and everlasting contempt, in being dispersed among all nations, and have become a by-word and an hissing even unto this day. Jeremiah, in chap. xxiii. 39, 40, predicted this very punishment, and calls it *an everlasting reproach*, and *a perpetual shame*. That the life or happiness enjoyed by believers in the kingdom of Jesus Christ is called *everlasting life* in the New Testament, we shall afterwards show.

After what has been said, we shall only glance at verses 3, 4. "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." It is a sufficient illustration of this verse to quote our Lord's words, Matt. xiii. 43. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father." See, on this whole context, Section vi., below. Compare Matt. xxiv. 13, and Luke xxi. 28.—And is not Dan. xi. 31—36, descriptive of this very time and events, of the Jews generally, and of our Lord's disciples when God's judgments came on that guilty nation? In the margin of the verse we are considering, it is rendered, "and they that be *teachers* shall shine as the brightness of the firmament." How applicable this was to the apostles and first teachers of Christianity, needs no comment, for the teachers of the seven churches of Asia are called *stars*, Rev. i. 20. And who doubts that the apostles and first teachers, shall shine in giving light forever and ever, or as we have seen this phrase explained, "throughout all generations?"

Let us now glance at verse 4, and dismiss this passage. "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased."—No man, we think, can doubt, that the time of the end, to which Daniel was to shut up the words and seal the book, was the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. The preceding verses show that to this time he did refer, and it is frequently called the end, in the New Testament. See 1 Cor. x. 11; Heb. ix. 26, and other passages. See particularly Matt. xxiv. 3, where the disciples ask our Lord—"What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world or age." But notice what is said verse 14, to show that many should run to and fro and knowledge should be increased before this end came. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Before the end came, or the destruction of Jerusalem, the sound of the apostles' doctrine had gone out into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. These things, and many others which I must omit, show, that Daniel here, and our Lord, Matth. xxiv., speak of the same people, the same time, and the same events. The whole of this passage is illustrated by our Lord's words, John v. 28, 29, an explanation of which we have given in the Universalist Magazine, vol. vii. pp. 103—7. To it we refer our readers, as our limits forbid its insertion.

Such are all the places in the Old Testament where *olim* is used, in whatever way rendered in the common version, and applied by the sacred writers. Reserving my principal remarks on the use of this word to the last Section, I would only observe here.

1st. That though this word is often used in the Old

Testament, as my readers have seen, and expresses duration in a variety of ways, yea, is used to express the duration of punishment in a few instances, yet it is not once used to designate any punishment beyond this mortal existence. All the passages where it is applied to punishment have been distinctly noticed, and Dan. xii. 1—4, has been particularly considered, which is the only text in the Old Testament on which the doctrine of eternal punishment could possibly be built. Our orthodox friends may be ashamed for having made such a mighty noise about their doctrine of eternal misery, and ought to make a public apology to the world for their conduct. The better informed among them have conceded that this doctrine is not taught in the Old Testament, nor could any of them continue to believe it, if they could only be induced to examine the subject.

2d. If *olim* is so often used in the Old Testament, and is sometimes used to express the duration of punishment, yet is never used to express the duration of punishment beyond this state of existence, when and how came the doctrine of everlasting punishment after death to be known among men? In the First Part, we have shown its origin to be human. If our orthodox brethren still venture to assert that its origin is divine, it is their work to show this. Its claims for our belief from the New Testament, I shall now proceed to examine.

SECTION IV.

GENERAL REMARKS ON AION, AND AIONIOS, AS USED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Most Lexicon writers assert, that *aion*, and the adjective *aionios*, are used to express an endless duration of time, though all of them admit, that they are also used to express a limited period. From this very fact has arisen long and violent contentions, whether these words, when used to express the duration of punishment, are to be understood in a limited or unlimited sense. Lexicons are not infallible, nor were they intended to determine, but only to assist us in ascertaining the true meaning of Scripture words. The words were used and understood long before Lexicons had any existence. Whilst we ought to avail ourselves of their assistance, yet every man ought to examine for himself, from their general usage, the context of the places, and other circumstances, if the senses of words given by them be correct. To receive implicitly what they say, is only to perpetuate their errors, if the writers have inadvertently or intentionally committed any.

It is universally allowed, by all competent judges, of whatever sect, that *aion* and *aionios* are frequently used to express a limited duration of time. Parkhurst says, *aion* "denotes *duration* or *continuance of time*, but with great variety." Ewing says it signifies "*duration, finite, or infinite; a period of duration, past, or future; an age, duration of the world*, Deut. xxxii.

7; Luke i. 70; plural, *ages of the world*, 1 Cor. ii. 7, hence *human life in this world*, Luke xvi. 8, or *the next*, Mark x. 30, *our manner of life in the world*, Psalm xc. 8; Eph. ii. 2, *an age of divine dispensation, the ages*, generally reckoned three; that before the law, that under the law, and that under the Messiah, Matt. xxiv, 3; and xxviii. 20; 1 Cor. x. 11; Heb. xi. 3, by faith, we understand that the ages were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are (now) seen, did not arise out of things which did (previously) appear; compare verses 1, 7, 26, 27, *an indefinitely long period of time;* hence *eternity;* Exod. xiv. 13; Luke i. 55; John iv. 14; Psalm xix. 9; Gal. i. 5; Rev. xx. 10, from eternity to eternity; 1 Chron. xxix. 10; Ps. xc. 2." On the word *aionios*, Ewing says, it signifies "*eternal*, Exod. iii. 14, 15; Matt. xxv. 46; Rom. xvi. 26, *chronoi aionoi*, ages of the world, periods of the dispensations since the world began, Rom. xvi. 25." See Parkhurst for a similar explanation, but let the reader examine their proofs.

The word *aion* is compounded of *aei*, always; and *on*, being; which is interpreted by Parkhurst and others, "always being." Yet he says, "*it denotes duration, or continuance of time, but with great variety!*" He allows that *aei*, always, signifies "*ever*, in a restrained sense, that is, at some stated times, very frequently, continually." Acts vii. 51, and 2 Cor. vi. 10, to which he refers as proof of its meaning *ever*, in an unrestrained sense, do not prove his point, for surely the Jews did not eternally resist the Spirit of God, nor did the apostle mean that he rejoiced eternally.—Its sense seems evidently to be *perseveringly*, but not endless in duration. Had Parkhurst found any texts more to his purpose, no doubt but he would

have quoted them. All the texts where he thinks *aion* means a proper eternity, will be considered in their place.

It is a remark, which has often been made, that the abjective *aionios* cannot signify more than the noun from whence it is derived, for, if the latter only expresses limited duration, the former cannot express endless. A stream cannot rise higher than its fountain without mechanical force, nor can *aionios* express a longer duration than *aion*, without a forced construction of meaning. Though Parkhurst asserts, that it means "eternal, having neither beginning nor end." yet he allows that it signifies "*the ages of the world, the times since the beginning of its existence.*" And adds—"the Seventy frequently use this adjective for the Hebrew *oulem*." But from an examination of the texts in the Old Testament, where this word occurs, the reader can judge, if any thing conclusive can be drawn from it as expressing endless duration. From an examination of all the texts where it is used to express the duration of punishment, we think it proved, that it does not express endless duration, nor does it even refer to punishment in a future state of existence. Whether *aionios*, its corresponding word in the New, does this, we shall see when we come to consider the passages in which it occurs. If it did, the one word certainly does not correspond to the other, for there is an inconceivable difference between limited and endless duration. All this difference is added by the New Testament writers to the word *aionios*, if it expresses the eternity of punishment. It has been said, that *aionios* when it stands alone, signifies duration without end. But how can it stand alone? For if an adjective, it must have some noun, either expressed or understood, with which it is connected, and which it

qualifies. If a man should say—"eternal," the question would immediately be asked him, eternal what? If he meant to be understood, he would inform us what thing he considered to be eternal; such as—eternal God, eternal life, eternal punishment. It is the noun, then, or the thing to which this word is applied, which must determine the extent of duration expressed by it; and if *aion*, from which it is derived, does not express endless duration, but an age, how can the adjective express a longer duration, unless we say the word derived contains more than that from which it is derived, or the stream contains more, or rises higher than the fountain? Allowing it to be applied to God, who is without beginning or end, what does this prove? Can this make God so, or does it fix the meaning of this word as expressing endless duration? Not unless we say, words expressing a limited time cannot possibly be applied to him: or if applied, must derive an unlimited, yea, infinite sense from such an application. Our orthodox friends would not reason so in other cases. The terms *good* and *great* are adjectives, and are applied to God. But do they contend that they are to be always understood in an infinite sense, or expressing an infinite degree when so applied? Surely not, for how could they in this case maintain their doctrine of infinite, endless misery?—Seeing it is said, "the Lord is *good* unto all," and that "*great* is his mercy."

But again, the words are used in the plural number. But how can words capable of being used plurally signify a proper eternity? For eternity is one, Eternities are never spoken of. People speak of eternity to come, and eternity past, but still it is only one uninterrupted, endless continuance. The past eternity had no beginning, nor had it an end when the future

eternity began, for in this view it could not be a proper eternity, as it had an end. In fact we cannot form a distinct, definite idea of eternity, for if this could be done, we must either be finite ourselves or necessarily limit it.

In our English version I find *aion* rendered seven times never, once course, twice ages, thirty-seven times world, once without end, once eternal, twice ever, sixty-six times forever, and four times for evermore. In several places it occurs twice in the same text. The adjective *aionios* I find is rendered three times *world*, once *forever*, forty-one times *eternal*, and twenty-four times *everlasting*. As forever, eternal and everlasting, are English words which convey the same idea it is unnecessary to make any distinction in introducing the passages where they occur, whether the translation of *aion or aionios*. In rendering *aion* and *aionios* in the New Testament, our translators have given us considerable variety as they did in rendering *olim* in the Old Testament. In only two instances, however, have they rendered them by the word *age* or *ages*. But many translations of the New Testament have been made since, where *age* is given as a better rendering of these words. It is, I believe, now generally agreed by critics and commentators, both *orthodox* and *otherwise*, that *age* ought to be the rendering of this word in a variety of places, some of which shall be noticed in their place.

It is universally allowed, that *aion* and *aionios* are the words used in the Seventy's version in rendering the Hebrew word *olim*. A very slight inspection of this version will satisfy any one of its truth. It is well known that our Lord and his apostles quoted the Seventy's version. And Mr. Stuart observes, that although "the New Testament was writen in Greek,

yet its idiom is Hebrew." He calls it "the Hebrew Greek of the New Testament." Indeed the longer I study the two Testaments I am the more convinced, that in understanding the phraseology of the New, we must recur to the Old Testament for our explanations. The translators of our common version, have rendered these Hebrew and Greek words, generally, by the same English words, such as, world, everlasting, eternal, forever, and forever and ever. This is the case, whether the words are applied to God, or to punishment, in the Old or New Testaments, nor is it intimated that the original words, or the words by which they are rendered, have a more vague and indefinite meaning in the former than they have in the latter. To an English reader, everlasting and forever are the same in both Testaments. If everlasting punishment is not taught in the Old Testament, it is not for want of as definite a word to express it, as is found in the New.

It is admitted by some, that the Old Testament is silent on the subject of everlasting puishment, yet they contend that it is taught in the New, and that *aion* and *aionios* are the words used to express its duration. But why admit the former and contend for the latter? In both Testaments punishment is mentioned, and in both everlasting and forever are applied to it. If it is found in one it ought to be found in both. Is it rational to suppose, that a doctrine of so much importance should be concealed for so many ages? How can this be reconciled with the divine character? Was this the mystery which was kept hid from ages, and from generations, but is now revealed to us by the apostles? No New Testament writer intimates, that punishment under the old dispensation was only tempory in its duration, but under the new was endless. All the Scripture writers speak of punishment in the same way, ex-

press its duration in similar language, nor would their readers suppose that the New Testament writers were believers in endless misery, and those of the Old not. It is generally allowed that the punishments threatened under the Old Testament were all of a temporal nature. The question may then be asked, whether this is not a mistaken view of the Old Testament punishments? That it is not, seems obvious from all the instances mentioned, and also from no other kind of punishment being recognized in the New, when the punishments under that dispensation are referred to. The New Testament, like the Old, speaks frequently of punishment. It will then be necessary to examine with care, all the texts in the New, where *aion* and *aionios* are rendered eternal, everlasting, or forever, and applied to punishment. Is it not possible that men may have been mistaken in affirming, that the punishments under the Christian dispensation are carried beyond death, and are of endless duration? May they not be temporal, as under the Mosaic dispensation, and why cannot the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, be applied to them, yet not endless in duration, just as well as to those under that dispensation? Christians do not seem to think of any punishment in this life for disobedience to God. No; it is all carried into a future state of existence, and considered to be endless. But surely the New Testament writers speak of punishments, and very awful punishments, in this life. Nor do they say, that under the new dispensation *an eternal punishment awaited any in a future state of existence, but did not under the old dispensation.* The places in the New Testament, where the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, are applied to punishment, are few in number. If they were even many, what could this certainly prove, for we have seen such words applied

to *things*, and even to *punishment of persons*, under the former dispensation, where all allow endless duration was not expressed by them ?

It has been asserted, that the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of endless misery, depends on the meaning of *aion* and *aionios* in the New Testament, and that this subject was reduced to a matter of verbal criticism. But why ought not its truth to depend as much on the meaning of *olim* in the Old Testament, which is rendered everlasting and forever, as those words are in the New ? It is a capricious mode of interpretation, to give this language a limited signification in the one case and not in the other also. The truth is, something besides the mere application of the word everlasting to punishment, must appear, to prove it of endless duration, for no man can deny, that it is applied to punishment when no one thinks endless duration was meant. Besides, the word *everlasting* being so frequently applied to *temporary* things, shows, that no great dependence is to be placed on such an argument.

One of the most plausible arguments arising from everlasting being applied to punishment in the New Testament is, that in Matth. xxv. 46, the same original word is applied both to life and punishment, and that if the one is not endless neither is the other. But permit me here only to remark—Why does not this equally apply to Dan. xii. 2, where a case of the same kind is found ? We have there shown that everlasting does not refer to endless duration of either happiness or punishment, or to any thing beyond this state of existence. When we come to consider Matth. xxv. 46, we shall see that this is a comment on Dan. xii. 2, and that both refer to the same everlasting punishment and happiness.

When people end the Old Testament, they seem to forget, that the New is the revelation of the same God addressed originally to the Jews; that it was written by Jews, and that its ideas and language are borrowed from Moses and the prophets. The writers adopt the words, phrases, and idioms used in the Old Testament, as well as quote formally from it. Dr. Campbell assures us that our Lord and his apostles spoke to the Jews in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used words and phrases with which they were familiar. And Mr. Stuart calls their writings the Hebrew Greek of the New Testament. If we would understand this book, we must not sit down to it as the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists or Universalists, but as Jews. The question is not, what sense do any of these sects put on the words, phrases, and idioms which are found in it, but in what sense were they understood among Jews from their own Scriptures. Is it asked—How are we to know this? I answer, from the Old Testament, from whence the New Testament writers borrowed them. The Old Testament is our dictionary of the language of the New, for the writers spake, not in the words which man teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth. While the New Testament is interpreted by sectarian dictionaries, how can Christians ever come to be agreed? Can any thing else be expected but bitter contentions among them? The meaning and extent of the words and phrases to come before us were well understood among the Jews. It is to be no concern of mine, how any sect now understands them, nor how I have formerly understood them myself, but how were they understood by the Jews, or what is their current sense in their sacred books. I am to consider myself, and the reader ought to consider himself, as living eighteen hundred years

ago, as being born and brought up a Jew; as familiar with the Old Testament; habituated to words, phrases, and idioms of language common among the Jews; and in fact, as far as possible to enter into the feelings, habits of thinking, and even the prejudices of that wonderful people.

New Testament usage of a word or phrase, is another very important rule of which we shall avail ourselves in interpreting the passages which shall be brought before us. For example, in Matth. xxiv. 3, we have the phrase *the end of the world.* Now, if this phrase does not mean here the end of this natural world, but the end of the Jewish age, we think it ought to have the same meaning in other places, unless the subject and scope of the writer entirely forbids it.—When I therefore come to this phrase, or others in the course of this investigation, all the places in which such phrases are found, will be brought forward at once and considered. This will save the repetition of remark, and will enable the reader to form a more correct judgment of the true Scripture meaning of such phrases.—Besides, if any inspired writer uses a word or phrase, and its sense is ascertained, if he uses it again, or repeatedly, it ought to be understood in the same sense, unless he by some way shows us he is to be differently understood. This is nothing more than every writer or speaker is entitled to, whom we wish to treat with common civility. If he uses it in another book, or if it is used by other sacred writers, our means of ascertaining its true sense are increased.

Much misunderstanding of the Scriptures has arisen from our overlooking what some may think but trifling circumstances. For example, some seldom take into view the writer, the time when he wrote, or the circumstances in which he was placed. They also over-

look the persons to whom he addressed himself, the circumstances in which they were placed, and the subject on which he discourses to them. The scope and drift of his discourse from the context, is seldom considered. Hence words, phrases, and verses are quoted, to prove what was never thought of by him. His words are quoted, and a sense affixed to them agreeable to the religious creeds of the persons, which, if the context was but consulted, would show them their mistake, and that, though unintentionally, they were perverting the Scriptures. We also may err, and fail in what we propose, but we shall at least make the attempt. Infallibility is no article of our creed; we would only do all in our power to produce a correct understanding of the Scriptures, without which, endless division and debate must exist among Christians.

SECTION V.

ALL THE PLACES NOTICED, WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE RENDERED AGES, COURSE, NEVER, FOREVER, EVERMORE, ETERNAL, EVERLASTING; BUT WHICH HAVE NO RELATION TO PUNISHMENT.

The word *aion* is rendered *ages*, in the common version, in the following places. Eph. ii. 7, "That in the *ages* to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace." It would have been absurd to have rendered it here, "that in the *eternities* to come." Nor would it have sounded well to have said, "that in the *worlds* to come," for the question might have

been asked, Pray how many eternities or worlds are to come? Our translators, then, not only own that this word signifies age, but were compelled to render it so in this passage. Again, Col. i. 26, "Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations." The remarks on the last text equally apply here. It would not have done to have said, "even the mystery which hath been hid from generations," for the term generations is used immediately after in the passage. Macknight on this text, says, "'The mystery which was kept hid from the ages and from the generations.' In the parallel passage, Eph. iii. 5, it is, 'which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles.' So likewise Romans xvi. 25, 'the mystery which hath been kept secret,' *chronois aioniois, in the times of the ages*, or during the Mosaic dispensation. For the meaning of the words *mystery*, and *ages*, see Eph. i. 9; Tit. i. 2, notes. Though the salvation of mankind by faith, was promised in the covenant with Abraham, and spoken of by the prophets, it was not understood by the Jews, see Eph. iii. 5, note, and therefore it is here called a *mystery*, or thing kept secret, in allusion to the heathen mysteries."

I shall also quote the following from Pierce, on this passage, as it sheds general light on this whole subject. "'The mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations.' The expression of *to mysterion to apokekrymmenon apo ton aionon*, is rendered by our translators, Eph. iii. 9, *the mystery hid from the beginning of the world;* but it is manifest from this place, where it is joined with *apo ton geneon*, that it is rightly translated here *hid from ages*, and that it ought to have been so translated in that place also. The same thing is meant when he speaks of the *revelation*

of the mystery, which we translate, *kept secret since the world began;* but Mr. Locke better renders it *in the secular times*, that is, the times under the law. I shall here transcribe his remark upon the words, Rom. xvi. 25, because it gives much light to this matter.—'Why the times under the law were called *chronoi aionioi*, we may find a reason in their *jubilees*, which were *aiones*, *sæcula*, or ages, by which all the time under the law was measured: and so *chronon aionion* is used, 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. i. 2. And so *aiones* are put for the times of the law, or the *jubilees*, Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21; 1 Cor. ii. 7; x. 11; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 26; Heb. ix. 26. And so God is called *the rock, aionon, of ages*, Isai. xxvi. 4, in the same sense that he is called the *rock* of Israel, Isai. xxx. 29, i. e. the strength and support of the Jewish state; for it is of the Jews the prophet here speaks. So Exod. xxi. 6, *eiston aiona*, signifies not as we translate it, *forever*, but to the *jubilee;* which will appear if we compare Lev. xxv. 39—41, and Exod. xxi. 2. Now that the times of the law were the times spoken of here by St. Paul, seems plain from that which he declares to have continued a mystery during all those times, viz. God's purpose of taking in the Gentiles to be his people under the Messiah; for this could not be said to be a mystery at any other time, but during the time that the Jews were the peculiar people of God, separated to him from among the nations of the earth. Before that time there was no such name or notion of distinction, as Gentiles. Before the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the calling of the Israelites to be God's peculiar people, was as much a mystery, as the calling of others out of other nations was a mystery afterwards. All that St. Paul insists on here, and in all the places where he mentions this mystery is to show, that though

God had declared this his purpose to the Jews, by the predictions of his prophets among them, yet it lay concealed from their knowledge, it was a mystery to them, they understood no such thing; there was not any where the least suspicion or thought of it, till the Messiah being come, it was declared by St. Paul to the Jews, and Gentiles, and made out by the writings of the prophets which were now understood.'"

Aion is rendered *course*, Eph. ii. 2, "Wherein in time past, ye walked according to the course of this world." Macknight says, "Chandler observes that the Greek word *aion*, and the Latin *avum*, which corresponds to it, signify the life of man; and by an easy figure, the manner of a man's living." That *olim*, in the Old Testament, often signifies a man's lifetime, has been seen above. And *aionion* signifies the lifetime of Onesimus, Phile. 15. See Macknight on this verse.

The Greek phrase *eis ton aiona*, occurs in the following texts, and is rendered in our version *never*.—John iv. 14, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst." And viii. 51, "If a man keep my saying he shall never see death." See also verse 52. In chap. x. 28, it is said, "they shall never perish," referring to Christ's sheep. And xi. 26, "whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." And xiii. 8, Peter said to Jesus—"thou shalt never wash my feet." Dr. Campbell in his note on John ix. 32, says, concerning the phrases *ek tou aionos* and *eis ton aiona*, "but in popular language, the former often denotes no more than from the beginning of the world, or even from very early times; and *eis ton aiona* does not always means to eternity, in the strict sense of the word. That the use is nearly the same in the Pagan writers, has been very well shown by Wetstein."

The same Greek phrase *eis ton aiona*, is rendered in the following passages *forever*. In Matth. xxi. 19, it is said of the fig-tree, "let no fruit grow on thee henceforward *forever*." See also Mark xi. 14. In Luke i. 55, it is said, "as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed *forever*." And John vi. 51, "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever." See also verse 58. And viii. 35, "And the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the son abideth ever." John xii. 34, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever." And xiv. 16, "He shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever." Heb. v. 6, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." And vi. 20, and vii. 17, 21, where the same is repeated.—Verse 24, "But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Verse 28, "but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the son who is consecrated for evermore." 1 Peter i. 23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed but incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." And 1 John ii. 17, "But he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." And 2 John 2, "for the truth's sake which dwelleth in us, and shall be with us forever." See some other texts below, where this phrase is differently rendered, and is used to express the duration of punishment.

On all these texts, where this phrase, *eis ton aiona*, occurs, we would remark, that it is used in a similar sense as *olim* in the Old Testament, where it is said of certain cities, that they should be an heap, or a desolation forever; such as the example of the fig-tree, which passage Dr. Campbell renders—"let no fruit grow on thee henceforward." It is also used to express the period of a man's lifetime, as in the Old Tes-

tament. The servant or slave may be sold, or the year of release may set him free, but the son abideth forever, or all his days. And whoever compares John xiv. 16 with verses 1—5, and with verse 12, may see reason to think that our Lord's meaning was—the comforter I shall send you will not, like me, leave you before you die, but will continue to be with you all your days. Was not this the way Christ was to fulfil his promise, Matth. xxviii. 20, in being with his disciples unto the end of the world or age? See on this text below. Besides, when Paul said he would eat no flesh while the world standeth, did he mean any thing more than all the days of his life? In this sense Macknight understands him. I would merely suggest it for consideration, if his meaning is not, I will eat no flesh while the age or Jewish dispensation endures, which was then vanishing away. I should think the above Greek phrase, is also used as in the Old Testament, to signify throughout your generations. Such seems to be its sense in Luke i. 55, and also where the word of the Lord is said to endure forever, 1 Peter i. 23, 25, and comp. Heb. ix. 14. But to see what is the meaning of the phrase, see the Seventy's version, from whence it is taken. *Eis ton aiona* is the rendering there of *olim* in a vast number of instances, which it would be tedious to enumerate. See the quotation from Pierce, on Col. i. 26, above.

The phrase, *eis tous aionas,* is used in the following places, and is rendered forever and for evermore.—Matth. vi. 13, "for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever." Luke i. 33, "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Rom. i. 25, "and served the creature more than the creator, who is blessed forever." Rom. ix. 5, "who is over all God blessed forever." And xi. 36, "to whom be glory

forever." And xvi. 27, "to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ forever." 2 Cor. xi. 31, "the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore." Heb. xiii. 8, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 16. In the following texts, the phrase *eis tous aionas* occurs, and is joined with *ton aionon*, and rendered "*forever and ever*," in ascriptions of praise to God and to Christ. Thus for example, Gal. i. 5, "to whom be glory forever and ever." The same for substance is repeated in the following texts, which it is unnecessary to quote. Philip. iv. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Peter iv. 11, and v. 11; Rev. i. 6, 18; iv. 9, 10; v. 13, 14; vii. 12; x. 6; xi. 15; xiv. 11; xv. 7; xix. 3; xx. 10, and xxii. 5. It occurs also in 1 Tim. i. 17, in an ascription of praise to God, which I shall quote, as it requires some notice. "Now unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." When God is here said to be the "king eternal," most people think the apostle meant to describe the endless duration of the divine being. But on this text let us hear Macknight, who thus writes: "Now to the king eternal. Perhaps, *to de baisilei ton aionon*, may be better translated, to the king of the ages, namely, the age before the law, the age under the law, and the age under the Messiah. According to this translation, which is perfectly literal, the apostle's meaning is, To him who hath governed the three dispensations under which mankind have lived, so as to make them cooperate to the same great end, the pardoning of sinners, and who is immortal, &c. be honor, and glory forever, ascribed by angels and men." There is no cause for alarm with good people, that these views are attempting to do away the eternal duration of God, for

surely his endless existence is independent of the meaning of a Greek word, whether you give it a limited or an unlimited signification. Besides, in this very passage he is called the "immortal (*aftharto*) God." In some copies it is the *athanato*, or undying God. No one can doubt that Macknight's rendering is a literal, correct one. The apostle is then rendering praise to God, who is king throughout all the ages, that before the law, under the law, and the age also of the Messiah. This king purposed an eternal purpose, Eph. iii. 11, which Macknight thus renders, "according to the disposition of the ages, which he made for Christ Jesus our Lord." See his whole note on Eph. iii. 11, part of which I shall only quote. *Aion, age*, is a word of various signification. Here, in the plural, it denotes the dispensations of religion under which mankind have been placed; namely, the *Patriarchal*, in which a Saviour was promised; the *Mosaical*, in which he was typified; and the *Christian*, in which he was manifested in the flesh. and preached to the world, as come. All these ages or dispensations, the apostle saith, God planned and brought to pass for the sake of Christ Jesus; that is to prepare mankind for his reception. Rom. xvi. 25; Tit. i. 2, (see the note on that verse,) *chronoi aionioi*, signifies the ages of the law, or Mosaic dispensation. And Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 26, *aiones*, signifies the Jews, living under that dispensation."

There are a few more texts, in which the words everlasting and eternal occur, to which we shall now pay some attention, in connexion with these quotations. When God is called the king of the ages, the question occurs—What ages? According to Ewing and others, the answer is, the age before the law, the Mosaic age, and the age of the Messiah. The king of the ages then, disposed, or appointed the ages, for

Christ Jesus. Before the Mosaic age, a promise of life was given in Christ Jesus, Tit. i. 2. This we shall see more fully afterwards. It was promised to our first parents; also to Abraham, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. This was done during the patriarchal age. During the Mosaic age, the law was added to the promise until the seed should come. Many things connected with this dispensation, we have seen, were called everlasting, but having answered the purpose for which they were added to the promise, have vanished away. The age of the Messiah succeeded it, but it is to be succeeded by no other. When the end of it comes, Christ is to deliver up the kingdom to God the father, which appears to be at the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. xv. 24—29. Several things during the reign or kingdom of Messiah in this age, is called everlasting or forever. His kingdom is called "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Peter i. 11. And surely it may be called so, with more propriety than many things under the Mosaic age or dispensation, for this kingdom is not to be superseded by another taking its place, for when it closes it is said—"then cometh the end."

The gospel of the kingdom of the Messiah, is called "the everlasting gospel preached to the nations," Rev. xiv. 6. And why is it called everlasting? Because it shall be preached as long as the kingdom of the Messiah shall continue, which shall be to the period called the end. Hence it is said, the word of the Lord endureth forever, 1 Peter i. 23. And Christ promised that the spirit or comforter should abide with his disciples forever, and is called the eternal spirit, Heb. ix. 14. Some copies, however, only read Holy Spirit.—Such as believe the everlasting gospel, and enter into

the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, receive everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, 2 Thess. ii. 16. Or, as Macknight says—"that is, the means of never failing consolation." To be so highly honored is thus expressed by Peter, 1st Epistle v. 10, "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus." Let it be observed, that eternal glory is not said to be a future thing, but that to which Peter says they were already called. They receive the promise of eternal inheritance, Heb. ix. 15. If the land of Canaan was given to Israel, and called an everlasting inheritance, as it often is in the Old Testament, how much more might the inheritance in the kingdom of Jesus Christ bestowed on Christians, be called an eternal inheritance? It should be recollected that the apostle was writing to Hebrews, to whom such language was familiar. Besides, this, we shall afterwards see, is the same that our Lord calls enjoying eternal life in the world to come. And is it not the same that Paul calls inheriting the kingdom of God and of Christ, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 21?

The new covenant, like the covenants under the Mosaic age, is called the everlasting covenant. And surely it may be called so, for it is not to vanish away, and give place to a new and better covenant, like that of the old. Christ's blood was that by which this new covenant was confirmed, and is called the blood of the everlasting covenant, Heb. xiii. 20. Having purged his people, not as under the law with the blood of goats and calves, "but by his own blood, he entered in once unto the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption," Heb. ix. 12. "And being made perfect through suffering, became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him," Heb. v. 9. Christ's salvation

is called a great salvation, Heb. ii. 3, probably in reference to other salvations which God wrought for ancient Israel. And here it is called eternal in the same comparative sense, for God wrought many salvations for them. This salvation was abiding. Comp. Luke i. 74, 75. Is it asked—Salvation from what? I answer, not from hell and endless misery, for this is no where said in Scripture, but from sin and death, which Christ shall finally accomplish. See 1 Cor. 15.

In 2 Peter iii. 18, we have the following ascription of praise. "To whom be glory both now and forever." The Greek here is *eis hemeran aionios*. Macknight says this is "unto the day of eternity." But how can this be, for what has eternity to do with days?—Besides, how does this agree to some quotations made from him respecting *aion*, which he says means an age. We should say the text simply says—"to him be glory both now and unto the day of the age." Some copies have it, "unto the age of ages," similar to passages noticed above. We should think the duration expressed is "during the age of the Messiah." Luke xvi. 9. "That when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Dr. Campbell says, "the epithet *unrighteous*, here applied to mammon or riches, does not imply acquired by injustice or any undue means; but, in this application, it denotes *false* riches, that is, *deceitful*, not to be relied on." Well, does not the epithet *everlasting*, applied to habitations, mean stable and satisfactory? See on Psalm xlix. 11, and on 2 Thess. ii. 16, and other texts above. But as it is applied, not to punishment, but to happiness, it requires no further attention.

2 Cor. iv. 17, 18, and v. 1, I shall quote together. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight

of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are enternal. For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." In these verses, *glory* is contrasted with *affliction*, *weight* of glory with *light* affliction, and *a far more exceeding and eternal* weight of glory, with affliction which is but for a *moment*.—Besides, things which are *not seen*, are contrasted with things which *are seen*, and the *eternal duration* of things not seen, with the *temporary duration* of things which are seen; and an *house not made with hands*, is contrasted with *the house* of *this tabernacle*, and the house not made with hands *eternal in the heavens*, with the *earthly* house of this tabernacle. But notice, the duration of these things is said to be *in the heavens*, and we think could be shown from the context, to refer to that state of things after the resurrection, when mortality is swallowed up of life, verse 4. See the whole context, and a paper in volume vii. of the Universalist Magazine on verse 10. The idea conveyed by the word eternal in all these verses, seems to be the stability of the things of that state compared to those of the present. Though the idea of their endless duration is included, yet the apostle's object seems to be more their *stability* than their *endless duration*. But as these passages have no relation to punishment, it is unnecessary to enter into further remarks, except to say, that the same or similar things are not said in regard to the punishment of any after the dissolution of their earthly tabernacle. This we shall see in Section vii., where all the passages are considered where eternal is applied to punishment.

SECTION VI.

ALL THE PLACES WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE RENDERED WORLD, CONSIDERED.

I FIND the Greek phrase, *eis ton aiona*, rendered world, 1 Cor. viii. 13. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth." Here the same Greek phrase is rendered world, which we have seen, is rendered never, forever, and for evermore. And why is it so rendered here? Because, it would not do to say—"I will eat no flesh while the never, forever, or everlasting standeth." It is plain that this phrase did not express endless duration by the sacred writers.

In Heb. i. 2, and xi. 3, we have the phrase *tous aionas*, and is rendered worlds. "By whom also he made the worlds. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." On the first of these texts Pierce says. "If we render the words by *whom also he appointed the ages*, the sense will fall in with Eph. iii. 11. See Mr. Locke upon that verse." See on this passage in the last Section. On the second, Macknight says it is literally—"*sæcula*, the ages." Ewing renders it, "By faith we understand the ages were framed by the word of God."—Those ages, he says, were reckoned three—"that before the law, that under the law, and that under the Messiah."

Eph. iii. 21. "Unto him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without

end." The Greek here is *eis pasas tas geneas tou aionos ton aionon.* Macknight says, this phrase literally is—"throughout all the generations of the age of ages." Is a proper eternity measured by generations? Surely not. By the age of ages seems to be meant the duration of Messiah's reign, or until he delivers up the kingdom to God the father, 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. Until then, God is to be glorified in the church by Christ Jesus. I would suggest it for consideration—Is not the age of the Messiah called the age of ages, in a similar sense as he is called "king of kings and Lord of Lords?" The age of the Messiah was that for which all the others were constituted, shall continue throughout all the generations of this world, and is to be superseded by no other, like the ages which have preceded it.

The word *aion* is not only rendered world, but we read both of the *beginning* and *end* of the world or age; the one class precisely answering to the other.—Let us first notice the texts which speak of the *beginning* of the age or world. Eph. iii. 9. "And to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Wakefield renders it thus, "was hidden from the ages in God." Macknight in his note on this text says, "Hid from the ages. So the original phrase *apo ton aionon* ought to be translated, as is plain from Col. i. 26, where generations are also mentioned." To render *aion* here by any word implying endless duration, would make the apostle speak of the beginning of the everlasting or eternal duration, which would be a contradiction in terms. Tit. i. 2. "In hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Wakefield renders it "promised before

the ages." Macknight, on this text, says, "*Before the times of the ages. Pro chronon aionion.* Supposing the word *aionios* in this clause to signify *eternal*, the literal translation of the passage would be, *before eternal times.* But that being a contradiction in terms, our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek language, have rendered it—*before the world began.* As Locke observes, on Rom. xvi. 25, the true literal translation is, *before the secular times;* referring us *to the Jewish jubilees*, by which times were computed among the Hebrews: as among the Gentiles they were computed by *generations of men.* Hence, Col. i. 26: *The mystery which was kept hid*, (*apo ton aionon kai apo ton geneon,*) *from the ages and from the generations*, signifies the mystery which was kept hid from the Jews and from the Gentiles. See this explained Rom. xvi. 25, note iii." Whitby's note is for substance, the same. Did God promise eternal life before the everlasting or the eternity began? The same or similar remarks apply to Rom. xvi. 25 "According to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began." Wakefield renders it, "which was kept secret from the ages of old." See Macknight on Rom. xvi. 25. Luke i. 70. "As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began." Permit me to ask: Has God spoken by his holy prophets which have been since the everlasting or eternity began? Who believes eternity has a beginning? Accordingly, Wakefield renders it "from the first." In his note he says, "*ap aionos*" signifies "or of old, literally, from the age." Dr. Campbell renders it: "as anciently he promised by his holy prophets;" and Whitby, "from the beginning of ages." Acts iii. 21. "Which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since

the world began." The Greek phrase is the same here as in the last text, and is rendered in the same way, and the same remarks apply to it, and need not be repeated. See Macknight on Romans xvi. 25.—In Acts xv. 18. The Greek is the same as in the last text, which saves all labor of transcribing or remarks. John ix. 32. "Since the world began was it not heard, that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind." Wakefield renders it, "never was it heard yet;" and Dr. Campbell has it, "never was it heard before." See on the preceding texts. 2 Tim. i. 9. "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began." The Greek phrase here, is *pro chronon aionion*, which Wakefield renders "before the age." Whitby, "before any age hath passed." Macknight, "before the times of the ages." See his note quoted on Tit. i. 2, above. 1 Cor. ii. 7. "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory." The Greek here, is *pro ton aionon*. Macknight renders it, "before the ages." He understands it, "before the Mosaic dispensation." See his notes on Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 9, and Col. i. 26, above.

Such are all the places where the phrases, the beginning of the world—from the beginning of the world—before the world—and since the world began, occur. On the whole of them I would remark,

1st. That in none of them is there any reference, as many suppose, to this material world, or its beginning. The word *aion* rendered *world*, signifies, by the consent of the above critics, and others, which might be quoted, simply *age*. Since the world began, is

since the age began. Before the world, signifies before the age, and from the beginning of the world, means from the beginning of the age. If it be asked, what age? The answer is, the age or dispensation of the law of Moses. If this be true, and it is indisputable, all must see what a great change it makes in the sense of all the above passages. Besides, it deeply affects the sense of many others, and affords a key to the understanding of some, which we shall presently notice. So far from *aion* signifying this *material world*, the above critics have shown, that our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek language, have rendered Tit. ii. 2, "before the world began," which remark applies equally to the other passages. They have shown, that it refers to the dispensation of the law of Moses, which, as Locke observes, is called *aion*, the age, Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21. And *chronos aionioi*, because, under the law, time was measured by ages or jubilees. See all the abovequotations.

2d. The word for this "material world," is *kosmos*, and not *aion*. And the Greek phrase for "before the world," meaning this material world, is *pro tou ton kosmon*. See John xvii. 5. Besides, where it is used it is never contrasted with *aion*. For example, the beginning of the *kosmos*, world, is never contrasted with the end of the *aion*, or age, nor, the beginning of the *aion*, age, contrasted with the end of the *kosmos*, world.

3. Every person must perceive the absurdity of rendering *aion* in any of the above texts, by any English word which conveys the idea of endless duration. Were it done, we should read of the beginning of the everlasting, or forever, and of things which were done before the everlasting or forever began; yea, of things which God ordained before the everlasting or forever

Let any one go over all those passages, and he cannot help being convinced, that the sacred writers attached no such idea to this word. Are not men very much to blame, then, in being so very confident, that *aion* expresses the endless duration of punishment? By the general consent of critics and commentators, yea, by the very scope of the above passages, *aion* signifies age. We ought not, then, very hastily to abandon this as its meaning in other places, unless it is certainly shown, that this cannot be its sense, but means endless duration.

Let us now pay attention to another class of texts, which speak of the "end of the world or age," and correspond to the above, which speak of the "beginning of the world or age." This is nothing more than might be expected, unless the Jewish age or dispensation was to be of endless duration. Matt. xxiv. 3. "Tell us, when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" The Greek phrase here for "the end of the world," is *sunteleia tou aionos.* Dr. Campbell renders it—"the conclusion of this state;" and both Wakefield and Macknight—"the end of the age."—Indeed, all the critics and commentators which I have ever seen, allow that this phrase means the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. The whole discourse in which it occurs shows that this is a correct view of the expression. In a case so obvious, it would be useless to spend time in a formal proof of it. I may just notice, to understand *aion* here to mean endless duration of time, would represent the disciples as asking our Lord to tell them, what should be the sign of his coming, and of "the end of the everlasting or endless duration." But if it means age, it ought to be understood so in other places, unless good reasons can be

offered why it ought to be differently understood.—The next passage where it occurs is,

Matt. xiii. 36—42. "Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man: the field is the world: the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one: the enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Precisely the same Greek phrase as in the last text, occurs twice in this passage, and is rendered, in the common version, in a similar manner. Wakefield and Dr. Campbell render it in the same way, "the conclusion of this age," and "the conclusion of this state." But it is referred, by some, to the end of this material world, when all the wicked shall be cast into a furnace of fire, or into hell. But is this treating the language of the inspired writers with common respect? What man would put up with having his words so interpreted? But that the phrase, "the end of the world," has the same sense here as in the preceding passage I shall now briefly show.—The things which demand particular attention are

1st. The field in which both these seeds are said to be sown. It is said expressly, "the field is the world." The word for world here is *kosmos*, and not *aion*, which is also rendered world, verses, 39, 40. Now,

let it be particularly observed, that in these two verses where it is said, "the harvest is the end of the world," and "in the end of the world," when the tares were to be gathered, it is not the end of the *kosmos*, world, or field, in which the seeds were sown, but the end of the *aion*, or age, as in Matt. xxiv. 3. Our Lord declared that the end of this world, or age, was to take place during that generation. But in order to make out the common opinion, our Lord should have said, verses 39, 40, "the harvest is the end of the *kosmos*, or field, in which the two seeds were sown: and that in the end of this *kosmos*, world, the tares should be gathered and burned." But not a word is said about the end of the field, but only the end of the *aion*, or age, which many of that generation lived to see.

2d. Where this furnace of fire was and in what it consisted, into which the tares were cast at the end of the age. This furnace of fire is commonly believed to be in a future state of existence, and is just another expression for hell fire. But all this is taken for granted, which certainly ought to be proved. Where then was it? Let the Scriptures answer the question. In Isai. xxxi. 9, it is said, "The Lord whose fire is in Zion and whose furnace is in Jerusalem." It should be remembered, that our Lord spoke to the Jews who had the Old Testament in their hands, and without doubt knew that God had thus spoken by the prophet. But it may be asked, How was God's furnace in Jerusalem, and in what did it consist? Ezek. xxii. 17—23, will inform us of this—"And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross; all they *are* brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are *even* the dross of silver. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Because ye are all become dross, behold,

therefore, I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. *As* they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt *it;* so will I gather you in my anger, and in my fury, and I will leave *you there*, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you." Who can read this passage without perceiving where this furnace was, in what it consisted, and also who were cast into it? Permit me briefly to notice the following things from this passage, in connexion with our Lord's explanation of the parable under consideration. The prophet and our Lord both spoke of the same persons, the Jews. At the end of the age, as the prophet had declared, the whole Jewish nation had become "*dross*." With the exception of believers in Jesus, the nation of the Jews exactly corresponded to this description of them.—This one fact is sufficient to show, that the prophet and our Lord, had respect to the same time, people, and punishment. Our Lord seems to borrow his very language, in regard to the furnace of fire, from the prophet. Further, it was at the end of the age, or Jewish dispensation, God brought such dreadful miseries on the Jewish nation, described under the figure of a furnace of fire. Ezekiel declared that God would gather the Jewish nation into Jerusalem as men "gather metals into the midst of a furnace." This was literally fulfilled. With the strictest propriety it might be said, that *God gathered them*, for it was in obedience to the command of God the whole nation were assembled at the feast of the passover, when

Titus surrounded the city, and from which they could not make their escape. They had indeed become *dross*, and into this furnace they were gathered to be melted as metals are gathered to be melted in the midst of a furnace. Well, how did God melt them? This is figurative language, and is thus explained, verse 22, "And ye shall know that I, the Lord, have poured out my fury upon you." Upon that generation of the Jews came all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, Matt. xxiii. 35. Then was great "tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world unto this time, no, nor ever shall be," Matt. xxiv. 21. See also 1 Thess. ii. 16. If any one wishes to see how God melted them like metals in this furnace, or how the tares were cast into this furnance to be burnt, at the end of the age, let him consult Josephus' account of the destruction of Jerusalem. The above passage in Ezekiel, the 24th of Matthew, and the passage before us, all had their fulfilment in the unheard of calamities which came on that people. There was indeed, at this period, weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth, as our Lord declared.

But the following words strongly confirm the above remarks. At verse 43, our Lord said, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father." At the end of the age, when such miseries came on the unbelieving Jews, the righteous, or Christ's disciples, did shine forth in the kingdom of their father. Observing the signs of the approaching calamities, Matt. xxiv., they left the city and were preserved, as stated by Macknight on this chapter. Our Lord told them, Luke xxi. 28. . "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Previous to this, Christians suffered the most severe perse-

cutions from the Jews, but then they had rest from their persecutors. At that period the kingdom of God came with power. Christ was glorified in them, and they were glorified in him. See on 2 Thess. chap. i., below. In the words—"then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their father," there seems to be an allusion to Dan. xii. 2, which has been shown, refers to the same time and events.

Such is a brief statement of our views of this passage. In confirmation of them I would add the following. It has been shown that the temporal judgments of God on the Jewish nation are set forth under the figure of a furnace of fire. Now, we call on any man to produce a single passage, where a punishment in a future state of existence, is described under such a figure. It will not do to take it for granted, that it is done by our Lord in this passage, and in face of the evidence we have adduced to the contrary. No; let proof be brought forward that this is his meaning. Let it be accounted for, why the temporal calamities which came on the Jewish nation are spoken of under the figure of a furnace of fire, yet future eternal punishment is never so represented in the Scripture?—Besides, let some reason be given why the same Greek phrase, rendered the end of the world, Matt. xxiv. 3, and allowed to mean the end of the age or Jewish dispensation, should not also mean the very same thing in the passage before us? Scripture usage, both as to this phrase and the furnace of fire, is against the common opinion, and in favor of the views I have advanced. It is very evident also from the New Testament, that at the end of the Jewish age, a separation was to take place, and is represented under various figures, as well as in plain language. In the passage before us, this separation between the righteous and

the wicked, is represented by separating tares and wheat. In others, separating chaff and wheat, good and bad fish, &c. The question is—Did a separation take place at the end of the Jewish age, answerable to these figurative representations? I answer yes. The whole Jewish nation were like chaff and wheat promiscuously on the same floor, whether believers in Christ, or unbelievers. Or like good and bad fish in the same net, or as tares and wheat growing in the same field. But at the end of the age a separation did take place, when the Jews were scattered among all nations, and the separation between them and Christians, or children of the kingdom, has continued to this day.

It is very evident, that *aion*, in this passage, could not well be rendered by any word signifying endless duration. If it were, it would make our Lord to say, "the harvest is the end of the everlasting or forever," and, "so shall it be in the end of this everlasting or forever." But who would impute such things to him, who spake as never man spake? To suppose he did, would make a plurality of forevers; for *this forever* implies another forever. Besides, it shows that forever is to end, and that the endless punishment of the wicked is only to begin at the end of the forever, if the furnace of fire means hell fire in another state of existence.

Any objections which have occurred to the views advanced, I shall state and answer.

1st. "How, upon your views, could it be said, that the devil sowed the tares among the wheat?" If this be any objection against my views, it lies equally against the common view taken of this passage. If my views of the devil be correct, this objection has no force.

2d. "Upon your views of this passage, how are angels to reap the harvest at the end of the age?" In reply, let it be noticed, that the term angel simply signifies a messenger. Let any one consult Whitby or Macknight, and he will see that the angels here referred to were not angelic spirits, but human messengers. He will also see how the separation at the end of the age was effected by them. But see on Matt. xxv., below.

3d. "Why was the temporal miseries which came on the Jews represented under the figure of a furnace of fire?" Answer; for a very good reason. A furnace of fire was the severest punishment which an eastern despot could devise. See Daniel iii. The temporal judgments which came on the Jews at the end of the age were such as the like had never been before, nor shall the like ever be again. The most severe eastern punishment, a furnace of fire, is therefore chosen to describe them. See Mark xiii. 19, 20.

Matt. xiii. 47—50. The same Greek phrase as in the two preceding texts occurs here, and is rendered in the same way. As our Lord is only illustrating the same things, and uses the very same figure of a furnace of fire, we forbear transcribing it, or remarking on it. The remarks made on the last passage are sufficient.

Matt. xxviii. 20. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Precisely the same Greek phrase occurs here as in the foregoing texts, and is rendered the same way in the common version. Wakefield renders it—"the conclusion of the age;" and Campbell—"the conclusion of this state." Parkhurst considers the Greek

phrase here as referring to the end of the age of the Messiah, and as equivalent to the end of this world, yet precisely the same phrase, Matt. xxiv. 3, he says signifies the end of the Jewish age or dispensation.—But I ask—Why depart from the obvious sense of this expression, Matt. xxiv. 3? Scripture usage ought not to be departed from without good reasons. What leads to such a departure here, probably, is, that to say "the end of the world" means the end of the age or Jewish dispensation, would limit Christ's promise to be with his disciples to this period. This would not certainly follow. But I shall proceed to show that in the sense Christ here promised to be with his disciples, it was not needed beyond the end of the Jewish dispensation.

It seems to be overlooked that our Lord was here addressing himself to the eleven apostles. Nor is it sufficiently understood in what sense he promised to be with them unto the end of the age. If verse 16, and the parallel texts are consulted, it appears that the apostles are the persons of whom he speaks, and he promised to be with them in a sense he never was, and never will be again with any other persons. He was with them, in teaching them the doctrine and laws of his kingdom, and enabling them to work miracles in proof of their being his ambassadors to the world. But will any man have the arrogance to affirm, that Christ is with him in such a sense? The vain and arrogant pretences of men to being ambassadors of Christ, we hope is now nearly exploded. Supposing then, that all the apostles had lived beyond the end of the age, or the destruction of Jerusalem, yea, let it be granted that they were all yet alive, there was no need for Christ being with them longer than to the end of the age. Am I asked why? I answer, before this period

arrived the gospel must be preached to all the world. See Matth. xxiv. 14. When it arrived, the apostles had all finished their work for which they were called, and all of them except John had also finished their course. Allowing that they had all continued to live to the present day, would Christ have continued to be with them, still teaching them and enabling to work miracles? I ask what need there was for this? All the will of God was revealed, and his word attested by miracles before the end of the age. Unless God had some further revelation to make by them, they could but repeat what before was preached and committed to writing, and fully attested by miracles. Were they now alive, would they not like us believe and obey what God, previous to the end of the age, enabled them to communicate to the world? This I am persuaded few will question. It is easily seen then, that the phrase "the end of the world," is in agreement with the usage of it in all the other texts, and that Christ's promise to be with his apostles at this period, was as long as his promise was needed, or indeed could be enjoyed by them in this mortal state.

I may just notice that I have no occasion to discuss the disputed question, that miracles were continued in the church for the first three hundred years. Granting that they were continued, let it be noticed, that none but the apostles were our Lord's commissioned and accredited ambassadors to the world. With them, and them only, we have to do as instructors. If he was with any others working miracles beyond the end of the Jewish age, it does not concern us, nor does it affect the question we are at present considering.

It is very plain that *aion*, here rendered world, was not used to express endless duration. To suppose this, would make our Lord promise to be with his apostles

to the end of everlasting or eternity. This would give rise to many questions. What time does eternity end? If it ends, pray when did it begin? And were the apostles to live to the end of eternity? Besides, if eternity ends, how is endless punishment to be established?

Heb. ix. 26. "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The word *world* occurs twice in this verse, but in the first it is the rendering of the word *kosmos*, and in the second that of *aionon*. Most readers suppose the first has a reference to the beginning of this material world, and the second to the end of it. The first is true, but nothing could be further from the truth than the second. Was it in the end of this material world Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself? It was not in the end of the *kosmos* or world mentioned in the first part of the verse, but in the end of the ages. Hence Macknight renders it thus: "but now once, at the conclusion of the ages, he hath been manifested to abolish sin-offering by the sacrifice of himself." All must see how absurd it would be to say here, that at the end of the everlastings or eternities, Christ appeared to abolish sin-offering. It is agreeable to the fact, that at the end of the ages or Jewish dispensation he did appear and accomplish this.

1 Cor. x. 11. "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." Though the Greek expression here is somewhat different from that used in the preceding passages, without a doubt the apostle referred to the same period. Macknight renders it "upon whom the ends of the ages are

come." In his note he says, "this may mean the end of the Mosaic dispensation, whose duration was measured by ages or jubilees; see Rom. xvi. 25, note 3, or, it may signify the last dispensation of religion. For there was the Patriarchal age, or dispensation, the Mosaic age, and the Gospel age." See Whitby's note on this text, who renders this phrase "the end of the ages."

In concluding our remarks on all these texts it ought to be noticed, that even admitting endless misery true, some of them have been perverted in attempting to prove it. How often has the furnace of fire afforded a theme of declamation to preachers, and cause of pain and distress to those who believed them. But is it saying too much, that they were only beating the air, and perverting Scripture to create fears where there really were none. My labor is not lost if have rescued such passages of God's word from such a perversion. In my explanation of this phrase, I have shown its usage to be uniform throughout the New Testament, and the precision and consistency of the sacred writers in its use are manifest. Every candid mind will allow, that all the passages which speak of the end of the world or age, correspond to the preceding which made mention of the beginning of the world or age.—In both classes of texts, we have seen that critics and commentators are agreed, both orthodox and heterodox, that *aion*, world, does not signify this material world, but age, state, or dispensation.

I shall now proceed to consider two other classes of texts in which *aion* occurs, corresponding to each other in the New Testament. Those which speak of "this world or age," and "the world or age to come." Let us first bring forward all those which speak of *this world*. *Aion* and *kosmos* both rendered *world*, are

very different in signification, and we do not recollect an instance, where these words are used as synonymous. In the texts now to be introduced, the word for *world* is not *kosmos* but *aion*. The phrases for "this world" are *tou aionos touto*, *to aioni touto*, and *en to nun aioni*, and occur in the following places. 2 Cor. iv. 4, "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." On this text Macknight says "some have it *age*." In Eph. vi. 12, "for we wrestle against the rulers of the darkness of this world." Wakefield here renders *aion* age. But again it is said, Gal. i. 4, "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world." Here again Wakefield has it *age*. On this text Macknight thus writes: "Evil age, *aionos poneros*. In Scripture, the age or world, is often put for the men of the world, and for their evil principles and practices. Thus Rom. xii. 2, "be not conformed, *aioni touto*, to this age." And in Luke xvi. 8, it is said "for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." In 2 Tim. iv. 10, it is said, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world." It surely cannot be meant, that he loved this present everlasting or forever: nor, that the children of this forever, were wiser than the children of light. In Rom. xii. 2, it is said—"and be not conformed to *this world*." In 1 Cor. iii. 18, "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world." I may just notice, that *aion* is here rendered age, both by Wakefield and Macknight. Again, 1 Tim. vi. 17, it is said, "charge them that are rich in this world."—And Tit. ii. 12, "Teaching that we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." In the two last texts the Greek is, *en to nun aioni*, and ought to have been rendered in both the same way,—

It is obvious, *aion* could not have been rendered everlasting or forever in any of these texts, without making the inspired writers speak nonsense. Nor can we perceive, why the above critics rendered *aion* age, in 1 Cor. iii. 18, and not so in all the other places. But to proceed: in Matth. xiii. 22, it is said, "and the cares of this world choke the word." See the same, Mark iv. 19. And 1 Cor. i. 20, it is said, "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" I may just notice here that the word for world in the last part of this verse and in verse 21, is not *aion*, but *kosmos* in the original. A marked distinction is made between them in the Greek, though this is concealed, by both being rendered *world* in our version. In 1 Cor. ii. 6—8, it is said, "howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect; yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to naught: but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world know: for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." The word *aion* here is rendered by Wakefield *age*, and Macknight's note on it shows us what is meant by the phrase rendered *this world* in all the above passages. He says, "Locke observes that in the writings of the New Testament, *aion outes*, this world, commonly signifies the state of mankind before the publication of the Gospel, as contradistinguished to the evangelical state or constitution, which is commonly called, *aion mellon*, the world to come." The following things are worthy of notice in this quotation. 1st. It is allowed that the phrase *this world*, does not mean this material world, but signifies the state of man-

kind before the publication of the Gospel. And 2d. That this state is contradistinguished from another called the evangelical state or constitution, and called *aion mellon*, the world to come. If this be correct, it essentially alters the sense of all the passages where these expressions occur. Am I asked, How it does this? I answer; that in the passages where the expression *this world* occurs, people understand it to mean this material world, and by the expression *world to come* is universally understood the future state of endless existence. The above quotation applies to all the texts where the phrases *this world* and *the world to come* occur. Such are all the texts where the phrase *this world* occurs by itself. It is found in some others, and is joined with the phrase *world to come*. Before introducing these I would notice the following things from the texts already brought forward.

1st. Supposing that *aion* in the above texts had been rendered everlasting, forever, or by any word conveying the idea of endless duration, what would have followed? We should then have read of this forever, this present forever, and of this present evil forever. This would naturally lead to the inquiry, how many forevers are there? And how many of them are evil? We should also be exhorted not to be conformed to this forever, and to become fools in this forever, and to live soberly, righteously and godly in this forever, and the rich that they should not be high minded in this forever. We should also be told, that the cares of this forever choke the word; and the question would be asked—where is the disputer of this forever? Besides, the apostle would be made to say, that he spoke of the wisdom and princes of this forever, even the wisdom which God ordained before the forever, and which none of the princes of this forever

knew. We should also read of the God of this forever, and the rulers of the darkness of this forever, and Christ gave himself that he might deliver us from this present evil forever.

2d. The word *world*, by which *aion* is rendered in the above texts conceals all these glaring improprieties, but it is obvious enough, that even world is not a very correct rendering. Who does not perceive this in the passages where it is said "this present world," and "this present evil world?" The questions here naturally enough occur—how many worlds are there, how many of them are evil, and is not this world always present? Why then speak of it not only as evil but as present? And, according to the sense commonly affixed to the word world, how could the apostle with truth say, that none of the princes of this world had known Christ? Surely some princes of this world knew him, for Abraham was a mighty prince, and rejoiced to see his day afar off and was glad.

3d. It is easily seen that if *aion* is rendered age in all the above texts, not only are such improprieties avoided, but a beauty and force is added to some of them, which is concealed by our present translation. Convinced of this, some of the most eminent orthodox critics and commentators, have rendered *aion* age, and the translators of our common version have done the same in several passages. Why it was not done in many more, deserves the reader's consideration. We believe it is now a generally conceded point, that age, in a great many instances at least, is a better rendering than the word world. I may add, if any one contends for *aion* to mean endless duration it may also be contended that there is more than one eternity, for this *aion* if it does mean forever, implies one or more of the same thing.

Let us now attend to the passages where the phrase "world to come" is used. The first is Heb. vi. 5, "And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come." The Greek for "world to come" is *mellontos aionos*. Let us then hear, what good orthodox writers say is the sense of this expression? Whitby, on this text, says, "The world to come doth, in the language of the prophets, and Jewish doctors, signify the times of the Messiah, who, in the prophet Isaiah, is called "the father of the world to come." See note on chap. ii. 5. The powers, therefore, of the world to come, according to the Scripture idiom, must be the external operations of the Holy Ghost, viz. the gifts of faith, of healing, of casting out devils, 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9, 'the working of miracles,' or the operations of powers." Peirce says, "The world or age to come is a Hebrew phrase and signifies the times of the Messiah, *oulm cha*." Macknight gives us the same explanation as Whitby; and Dr. Owen, whose praise is in all orthodox churches, explains this phrase in the same manner. See also the new Theological Repository, vol. i. pp. 51—53, for the same explanation, given at considerable length, all of which my limits forbid quoting. We have introduced, on the phrase "world to come," all these testimonies for several reasons. These authors are as one man agreed about the meaning of this expression. They are competent to judge in the case, and not one of them was ever suspected of unbelief in the doctrine of endless misery. What then is their united decision? They establish beyond all contradiction, that the phrase "world to come," does not mean the future eternal state of existence after death, but the age of the Messiah.

Heb. ii. 5. "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak."

The Greek phrase, here rendered the "world to come," is *oikoumene ton mellousan*, which evidently means the same as in the last text. Parkhurst, on the word *oikoumene*, says, "The world to come, Heb. ii. 5, seems to denote the state of the world under the Messiah, or the kingdom of the Messiah, which began at his first advent, and shall be completed at his second glorious coming. The Jews in like manner call the kingdom of the Messiah, *eba oulem*, the world to come, probably from the prophesy of Isai. lxv. 17, where it is represented by new heavens and a new earth. It is observable that Paul uses this phrase only in this passage of his Epistle to the Hebrews or converted Jews, as being, I suppose, a manner of expression peculiar to them, but not so intelligible to the Gentile converts." See Whitby and Doddridge on the place, and comp. Heb. vi. 5." See also Peirce on this text, and on Heb. i. 14. All these, and other writers which might be named, give the same explanation of the phrase, world to come, which I forbear quoting. But in the following texts the phrase, "this world," and "the world to come," are mentioned together.

Eph. i. 21. "Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that to come." The Greek here is, *ou monon en to aioni touto alla kai en to mellonti*, which Wakefield renders, "not only in this, but also in the future age."

Matth. xii. 31, 32. "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the son of man it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither

in the world to come." See the parallel texts, Mark iii. 29—30, and Luke xii. 10, which I need not quote. The common doctrine from these passages is—that neither before nor after death can the sin against the Holy Ghost be forgiven. As this doctrine has driven some to madness, and others to suicide, common humanity would say, "examine if it be true." Those who contend for it, overlook that it is implied that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come, if their view of this phrase be correct. But do they allow that any sins are to be forgiven after death? Taking into view all the above passages, let us consider,

1st. Wherein the great guilt of the sin against the Holy Spirit consisted. From Mark iii. 28—30, and other places, it appears that the guilt of this sin consisted in seeing miracles wrought and imputing them to the power of an unclean spirit. It was resisting the highest degree of evidence which could be given of the mission of our Lord. But on this point it is unnecessary for us to dwell. Therefore, let us consider,

2d. When or where it could not be forgiven. It is said it shall not be forgiven in "this world." This means, as we have seen from orthodox writers, it should not be forgiven in the Jewish age, which was then nearly ended. Nor could it be forgiven in the world or age to come, which we have seen from the same authors, means the age of the Messiah, which was to succeed the Jewish age or dispensation. Whitby renders the words, "neither in this age, nor the age to come." It seems then a very obvious case, that when it is said the sin against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come, there is no reference to a state after death. It simply means, it should not be forgiven while the Jewish age or dis-

pensation continued, nor under the age of the Messiah, which was then about to commence. Or, in other words, during the ministry of our Lord or his apostles, who both wrought miracles, which were necessary to be seen wrought and blasphemed against, in order to any person's committing this sin.

Well, its being said, "it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," is strong, explicit language, importing the non-forgiveness of this sin? It is, nor do we wish to lessen its force, but shall attempt to meet it fairly and fully. But let us first hear Macknight. He says—"or we may translate the clause differently, *it shall not be forgiven him neither in this age, neither in the age to come*, importing that no expiation was provided for the blasphemer of the spirit, either under the Jewish or Christian dispensations." What then was the unpardonable nature of the sin of blasphemy during the period called "this world," which we have seen means the Jewish age or dispensation? It is well known, that to the blasphemer under the law, no pardon was granted; no sacrifice could expiate his crime; he must suffer death.—Permit me now to ask, was the punishment of such persons unpardonable in any other sense than that they suffered temporal death? Even the blasphemer of the God of Israel, his blasphemy is not mentioned as unpardonable, so as to affect his future endless happiness. No one surely will contend, that to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit was a greater crime; for allowing the Spirit to be the third person in the Godhead, he is not greater than the God of Israel. How then do we understand this blasphemy to be a sin, which, when committed, the person's case is past all remedy? But other sins besides blasphemy were unpardonable under the Mosaic dispensation. The sin of Moses and Aa-

ron at Meribah was so, and was punished with death in the wilderness. The sin of Eli's house could not be purged with sacrifice nor burnt offering forever.—Murder was also unpardonable. They were to take the murderer from God's altar and put him to death. As "the world to come," then refers to the age of the Messiah, this sin is to be unpardonable, and unpardonable in the same sense as it was during the Jewish age called "this world." Its unpardonable nature we think must be understood in the same sense, for no distinction is made by our Lord in the two cases. If the sense in which it was unpardonable during the Jewish age, was, that the person must suffer temporal death for it, the same must be its sense under the age of the Messiah. It is generally admitted, that temporal death was the punishment of crimes under the old dispensation, and that temporal death was inflicted for crimes under the new, no one will dispute; for Annanias and his wife, persons in the church at Corinth, are noted examples; and John speaks of a sin unto death, for which even Christians were not to pray, 1 John v. 16, 17.

Stating then this sin at its utmost extent, persons were to suffer death for it, as was inflicted on the blasphemer of the God of Israel. What, some may say, do men suffer death for this sin in our day? I answer no, and for a very good reason, because it is impossible in the nature of the case to commit it in the present day. Is it asked why? I answer, because miracles must be seen performed by the person, and he must resist their evidence, and ascribe their performance to an unclean spirit, before he can commit this sin. It could only be committed by persons under the ministry of our Lord and his disciples, who wrought miracles. Did men now see these miracles, as the persons did whom

our Lord addressed, it could be committed, but unless the age of miracles return, it is impossible. The miracles wrought before the Jews, was the highest degree of evidence which could be given them that he was the true Messiah. Resisting and blaspheming them, rendered their case hopeless, for no further evidence could be given to convince them. But it may be said —Did the unbelieving Jews suffer temporal death for this crime? They could not be put to death for it by the Mosaic law, for they did not believe they had in this case blasphemed. Besides, the execution of this law was in their own hands. But death was inflicted on that evil generation of Jews, for upon them came all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. Not believing in Jesus, they died in, or rather by their sins, for the wrath of God came on them to the uttermost.

If the views which have been stated of the sin of blasphemy, and its punishment, be correct, it fully accounts for one remarkable fact, which is not easily accounted for on the common views entertained of it.— How is it accounted for, that our Lord nor his apostles ever made any exception of such persons, in preaching forgiveness of sins either to Jews or Gentiles? Our Lord commanded his apostles to begin at Jerusalem, but gives no directions to them to except a single individual whom they might address. John prohibits Christians from praying for one of their brethren, who had sinned a sin unto death, but not a hint is dropped, prohibiting forgiveness of sins to be preached to any who had blasphemed against the Holy Spirit. On my views of this sin, this is all as it ought to be, and as might be expected. But can it ever be reconciled with the common opinion, that those who sinned this sin placed themselves without the boundaries of God's mercy? Either they believed that none had commit-

ted it, or they believed that it did not except the persons, any more than others, from having repentance and forgiveness of sins preached unto them. Had they believed such persons were exceptions from the mercy of God, would they not have said, the sin against the Holy Spirit is utterly unpardonable? All you who have committed it, your situation is past remedy. We can neither pray for you, nor preach to you forgiveness." But we search in vain for any thing like this in all the inspired writings. The only thing like it is John's prohibition to Christians to pray for a brother who had sinned a sin unto death. But no one understands this as affecting the eternal condition of the individual, but the punishment of temporal death.

But it may be said—"Plausible as all this appears, it ought to be recollected, that it is not only said such persons 'hath never forgiveness,' but it is also added, that they are in danger of *eternal damnation*." I have not forgotten this, and shall now give it all due attention. The Greek phrase for "eternal damnation" is *aioniou kriseos*. I do not stop to remark, but simply notice, that the persons are only said to be in *danger* of this; whereas people in our day, speak with positive certainty, both as to this and Judas' being in hell. The word here rendered *damnation*, simply means punishment. It is so rendered in other passages. See Dr. Campbell's note on Mark xii. 40, where he shows this. The words *damned* and *damnation*, lead people's minds into a future state for this punishment.—This is a very false idea, and ought to be corrected; for the word damnation is used in the common version where they will allow it has nothing to do with a future state. See Rom. xiii. 2, and other places. We are aware it will be said, the word eternal joined here with damnation, shows that the punishment is in a future

state, and of endless duration. It is then allowed that the whole depends upon the word *eternal*. Indeed, I presume it is this word joined with damnation which leads most people to conclude that it is of endless duration. Would they ever have believed this doctrine had this not been the case? Let it be noticed,

1st. That our Lord, in the above passages, was addressing Jews. They were the persons who committed this unpardonable sin, if ever it was committed.—They had the occasion presented to them for its commission, as they chiefly enjoyed the ministry and miracles both of Christ and his apostles. Not a hint is dropped that any of the Gentiles ever committed this sin.

2d. Being Jews, they were familiar with the use of *olim* in the Old, and *aion* in the New Testament. And it has been seen, that *olim* in their Scriptures, is applied very often to things which were to end, and which have already ended. The person who would therefore understand this text and others in the New Testament, must consider how this language was understood among the Jews, and not how Christians now understand them.

3d. The Jews could not help seeing, that in their Scriptures, *olim*, rendered everlasting, was applied to a temporal punishment threatened them as a nation. This we have shown, and this we shall show hereafter on Matth. chap. xxv. and 2 Thess. i. 5—10. Now permit me to ask—Did any Jew, or did any one else ever conclude that the word *olim* described a never-ending punishment either in this or a future world?—As this will not be affirmed, permit me to ask, By what fair rule of interpretation do we then interpret eternal damnation or punishment in this passage to mean endless punishment in a future state? As our

Lord was speaking to Jews, is it not more Scriptural and natural to understand him as using this expression in agreement with the language of their sacred books, than in the sense Christians interpret it? In what other sense could our Lord use it, or in what other sense could Jews understand such language, but in the way it had been used by the preceding Scripture writers? But this will appear conclusive by considering,

4th. That in no part of the Old Testament, is *olim* ever used and applied to a punishment after death.—This we think a fact, which will not easily be shown to be false. The reader has had all the texts where the word is used in the Old Testament laid before him, and those in which it could be supposed to have such a sense have been particularly considered. Let him, then, judge if our Lord used, and the Jews could understand the expression, *eternal damnation*, in the sense we moderns put upon it. The proof, at any rate, lies with those who believe so, for no man can prove a negative. But we have in this case some proof, that our Lord neither meant, nor was he so understood by the Jews who heard him. First, no Jew believed that he was to suffer endless punishment either here or hereafter. See Whitby on Romans ii. Again, no doctrine our Lord advanced, could have been more displeasing to the Jews. They to suffer endless punishment who were the children of Abraham? No; this was far from their thoughts. But again, though our Lord and the Jews had many reasonings and contentions arising from his doctrines, do we ever find that any of them arose from his threatening them with endless punishment in a future state?—No, nothing like this appears. Either, then, our Lord did not theaten them with this, or if he did, they did

not understand him; or, if they did understand him, they acted very differently about from what they did on all other occasions. In this case, they submitted very tamely to a threatening, never before mentioned in their Scriptures, and directly in face of all their prejudices as a nation.

5th. We see nothing in the expression "eternal damnation," indicating endless punishment, any more than in others which we think we have shown refer to no such thing. Is this expression stronger in favor of the doctrine than "damnation of hell, the fire that shall never be quenched," with others, which we think has been proved in the Inquiry into the words Sheol, &c., to refer to temporal punishment? Or, is it stronger in favor of this doctrine than the expressions "everlasting fire, eternal punishment, everlasting destruction, with others, which we shall presently show have no such meaning? If these expressions refer to the temporal punishment of the Jews, why not also the expression "eternal damnation," before us? Jews who blasphemed against the Holy Spirit were addressed. The most convincing proofs had been offered them that Jesus was the Messiah. These they resisted, and blasphemed the power by which they were performed. They were soon to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and could not escape the damnation of hell. There remained for them no more sacrifice for their sins, but a certain fearful looking for, of judgment and fiery indignation to devour them as adversaries. Their sin was not to be forgiven, that their punishment might be averted. They were in danger of "eternal damnation," or punishment, even the everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, which as a nation they have suffered, and are still suffering. The Greek phrase, "*aioniou kriseos.*"

rendered "eternal damnation," may be rendered "of the age of judgment," or "of the judgment of the age" both words being in the genitive. It is called the damnation of hell, the fire that shall never be quenched, the greater damnation, and is set forth by the severest eastern punishment, "a furnace of fire." In plain language it is described by our Lord, Matthew, chapters xxiv. xxv.

Matt. xix. 27—29. "Then answered Peter, and said unto him, behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee: what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, that ye that have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelves tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life."—The parallel texts are, Mark x. 28—31, and Luke xviii. 28—30, which I need not quote. Mark and Luke say, "and in the world to come life everlasting." Wakefield's rendering is, "and in the age that is coming everlasting life." It will not be questioned, that the phrases, "this time," and "this present time" in these texts, express the same as is meant by the phrase "this world," or age, in preceding passages.—They all refer to the Jewish age, which was to be superseded by the age of the Messiah, and repeatedly called the age or "world to come." In fact no other age could come, for no other was promised, or expected by the Jews, but the age of the Messiah. But the phrase, "world to come," by most Christians is interpreted to mean, the state after death, and the phrase "everlasting life," the happiness to be enjoyed

in that state. But, that by "the world to come," is meant the age of the Messiah, is conclusively shown by orthodox writers above, who declare it is to end at Christ's second coming. See 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. My reasons for thinking, that the eternal life here spoken of, refers to the life enjoyed in the kingdom of Christ during the age of the Messiah, I shall as briefly as possible state:

1st. This appears from the Old Testament usage of the phrase "everlasting life," which occurs only in Dan. xii. 2, considered above. It is set in contrast with the shame and everlasting contempt which came on the Jewish nation at the end of the age. If their shame and everlasting contempt, were to be *endured* in this state of existence, why not the eternal life with which it is contrasted, be *enjoyed* also in the same state? The contrast would be incongruous if it is understood otherwise.

2. From the context of the passages under consideration, it is evident, that what our Lord said was in answer to Peter's question, verse 27, which was suggested by the discourse immediately preceding it, verses 16—27. According to Daniel's use of the words *eternal life*, what else could this man mean, than, what good thing shall I do, that I may enjoy the blessings of Messiah's reign, or enter into his kingdom? That this view of everlasting life, is agreeable to the passage before us, is evident, for it was to be enjoyed in "the world to come," or in the age of the Messiah. The Jews were familiar with Daniel's writings, and if in this sense it was used there, how could the Jews in our Lord's day understand it in a different sense without some explanation? That this was the sense in which it was used, appears to me evident from the following statements, and the texts referred to. In the

New Testament, "kingdom of heaven," and "kingdom of God," are phrases used to express the same thing: compare Matt. xix. 20, with verse 24, as an example. This is very obvious from comparing the four Gospels. It is also evident, that to "have eternal life," and to "enter into eternal life," also mean the same thing. Compare Matt. xix. 16, with verse 17. But let it be particularly observed, that to "enter into life," and "to have eternal life," is the same as "to enter into the kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God." This appears from comparing Matt. xix. 16, 17, with verses 23, 24. Also from comparing Mark ix. 43, 45, with verse 47, where entering into the kingdom of heaven and entering into life, are used as equivalent expressions. If these statements are not correct, we should think it a hopeless case, to ascertain the sense of Scripture by comparing one part of it with another. I may add, that "to be saved," verse 25 of Matt. xix., seems to be used as an equivalent expression for "having eternal life," verse 16, "to enter into life," verse 17, and "to enter into the kingdom of heaven and kingdom of God," verses 23, 24. Let us now look at the context of the passage before us. "And behold, one came and said to him good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life," verse 16. And compare Mark x. 17. Luke xviii. 18; Luke x. 25. Permit me now to ask—When this person asked what good thing he should do to "have eternal life," did he mean to ask, what he should do to obtain heaven and its happiness? We must doubt this, for we have seen that what he calls eternal life, verse 16, is to enter into life, verse 17, and to enter into the kingdom of heaven or kingdom of God, verses 23, 24. His meaning seems evidently to be, good master, what shall I do to enter in-

to the kingdom of heaven or reign of the Messiah, whose kingdom or reign is about commencing. If this be correct, it is easily perceived how exactly this sense of the phrase agrees with the only place in the Old Testament where everlasting life is mentioned.—Daniel told us that some should awake "to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."—This person seemed to be awaking to everlasting life, but we see that his trusting in his riches, still kept him from entering into the kingdom of God. One seems to have been so much awakened, that our Lord said he was not far from the kingdom of God, or obtaining eternal life. See Mark xii. 28—35.

3d. It appears from considering *where* or *when* this eternal life was to be enjoyed. Not a word is said in the passage, that this was in a future state of existence. It was to be when the Son of Man sat on the throne of his glory, and the apostles on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. But are the apostles to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel in a future state of existence? Well, when was this? The following writers shall inform us. Macknight, on this passage observes—"According to the common interpretation of these words, they relate entirely to the other life; implying, that at the general judgment the apostles shall assist Christ in passing sentence upon the Israelites." But so far from agreeing to this interpretation, he says—"In the seventh chapter of Daniel, the prophet, speaking of the erection of the Messiah's kingdom, says, verse 9, 'I beheld till the thrones were set (not *cast down*, as it is in our translation) and the Ancient of days did sit," namely, on one of the thrones that were set. 13, "And behold, one like the Son of Man came to the Ancient of days" while he sat on his throne, "and

they brought him near before him, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." By *the kingdom* that was given to the Son of Man, the prophet meant his mediatorial kingdom; and by *the glory*, his being seated beside the Ancient of days on one of the thrones mentioned verse 9, in testimony of his exaltation to that kingdom. The throne of his glory, therefore, which our Lord speaks of in the text, is the throne of his mediatorial kingdom, called the throne of his glory, in allusion to the representation which Daniel had given of it. In this kingdom, the apostles likewise were to be seated on thrones, and to judge the tribes; that is, were to be next the Messiah in dignity and office; his ministers, by whom he was to subdue and govern the church." See the whole of his note, a small part of which only I have quoted. See also Parkhurst on the word *krino*, who gives the same view of the passage. Dr. Campbell renders the 28th verse thus: "that at the renovation, when the Son of Man shall be seated in his glorious throne, ye, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge." In his note, part of which only I shall quote, he says, "We are accustomed to apply the term *regeneration* solely to the conversion of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general state of things. As they were wont to denominate *the creation, genesis,* a remarkable restoration, or *renovation,* of the face of things, was very suitably termed *paliggenesia.* The return of the Israelites to their own land, after the Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, the Jewish historian. What was said on verse 23, holds equally in regard to the promise we have here. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, *a renovation,* or *regeneration* of heaven and earth, when

all things shall become new; yet, in a subordinate sense, it may be said to have been accomplished when God came to visit in judgment that guilty land; when the old dispensation was utterly abolished, and succeeded by the Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles, from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted." See also Whitby's note on Matt. xix. 27, 28, to the same effect.

It is obvious from these statements that the passage has no reference to a future state of existence, but to the establishment of Jesus in the throne of his kingdom, when the Old Testament was utterly abolished, and from which period he has been judging the world in righteousness, and the people with his truth. He, as king, reigns in righteousness, and the apostles with him decree justice, and shall continue to do so until the period called *the end*, 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the father.—Can the statements of these writers be proved false? Besides, the apostles and others are not to enjoy eternal life until the day of judgment, if this be the time Christ refers to by sitting on the throne of his glory. Is it objected—"Were not the disciples in the kingdom of Christ, and enjoying eternal life in the sense which you have explained it, at the time our Lord spoke?" Yes, but it was not until the Son of Man came at the end of the Jewish age, that his kingdom came with power. See Luke xxi. 31—34; Mark viii. 38, and ix. 1. At this time it was profitable for his disciples *to enter into life* with the loss of all things dear to them, rather than go into Gehenna or hell, or to suffer all the miseries which came on the Jewish nation. See Mark ix. 43—50, and the Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c.

4th. This view of eternal life, enjoyed in the world

to come, is confirmed from the following context.—Our Lord having said, "and shall inherit everlasting life," immediately adds, "but many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." Here the chapter ends, but it is evident, the Saviour, in the beginning of the next chapter, goes on to illustrate his meaning by the parable commonly called the parable of the laborers in the vineyard. Well, let us ask the question, many that are first shall be last and the last shall be first, about what? The answer from the context evidently is, about inheriting everlasting life, or entering into the kingdom of God. Accordingly, our Lord says, "For the kingdom of heaven, (or inheriting everlasting life in it,) is like unto a man who is an householder, who went out very early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyards." This parable is interpreted by Macknight and others, of the calling of the Jews and Gentiles; for the Gentiles, who were the last in having the kingdom of God preached to them, were the first to enter into the kingdom of God, or enjoy eternal life in this kingdom; and the Jews, to whom it was first preached, shall be last in entering into the enjoyment of the same blessings. This must be understood of both Jews and Gentiles, generally, as a people.

5th. The view given of *eternal life*, will be confirmed, by attending to the general usage of this phrase in the New Testament. This must be done in a very brief way, for the texts are numerous where it occurs. The reader may consult the texts for himself; we shall give all the places where it is found, and shall propose some questions for his consideration. I find, then, *zoe* rendered *life*, and used to express what we call *natural life*, 1 Cor. iii. 22; James iv. 14; Acts viii. 33; Rom. viii. 38; John xii. 25; Acts xvii. 25; 1 John v. 16;

Luke i. 75 ; Philip. i. 20 ; Acts ii. 28 ; 1 Tim. iv. 8 ; 1 Cor. xv. 19 ; Rom. vii. 10 ; Heb. vii. 3 ; Acts vii. 19 ; Luke xvii. 33 ; Luke xvi. 25 ; Rev. xi. 11. It is also used to express the happiness, or the good a man enjoys in this life, Luke xii. 15 ; 1 Peter iii. 10 ; Luke xvi. 25 ; 2 Peter i. 3.

But I find *zoe*, life, used to designate that moral or spiritual life, enjoyed by believers in Jesus. Before believing, they are spoken of as alienated from the life of God, Eph. iv. 18. In believing, they pass from death to life, 1 John iii. 14, 15. They have repentance unto life granted to them, Acts xi. 18, and obtain justification of life, Rom. v. 18. By the power of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus they are made free from the power of sin and death, Romans viii. 2.—Their spirits or minds are alive, because of righteousness, Rom. viii. 10, and enjoy life and peace, verse 6. They have the light of life, John viii. 12. Walk in newness of life, Rom. vi. 4, and hold forth the word of life, Philip. ii. 16. The meat Christ gave them endured to eternal life, John vi. 27, and the water, a well springing up to everlasting life, John iv. 14.—They are exhorted to lay hold on eternal life, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 19, and seek for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, Rom. ii. 7. And by sowing to the spirit reaped life everlasting, Gal. vi. 8. They are exhorted to look for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life, Jude 21. Have their fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life, Rom. vi. 22. The life of Jesus was made manifest in them, 2 Cor. iv. 10—12. They were heirs of the grace of life, 1 Peter iii. 7. Were saved by Christ's life, Rom. v. 10, and are said to reign in life, Rom. v. 17. The names of such persons are said to be in the book of life, Philip. iv. 3 ; Rev. iii. 5 ; xiii. 8 ; xvii. 8 ; xx. 12, 15 ; xxi.

27, and xxii. 19. They drink of the water of life, John iv. 14; Rev. xxi. 6, and xxii. 1, 17. And by overcoming they were to eat of the tree of life, Rev. ii. 7; xxii. 2, 14, and obtain a crown of life, James i. 12; Rev. ii. 10. And mortality is at last to be swallowed up of life, 2 Cor. v. 4. The gate which led to this life was strait and the way narrow, Matt. vii. 14. Several persons asked our Lord what they should do to obtain or inherit eternal life, Matt. xix. 16; Mark x. 17; Luke x. 25, and xviii. 18. And it is evident from the context of all these passages, that to have eternal life, to enter into this life, and to enter into the kingdom of God, all referred to the same thing. See also Matt. xviii. 8, 9, and xix. 17, 29; Mark ix. 43, 45.

It appears, that man never would have known any other life, except natural life, but for the grace of God through Jesus Christ. Christ hath brought life and immortality to light, 2 Tim. i. 10. With a view to this, God promised eternal life, 1 John ii. 25. It was promised before the Jewish age began, Tit. i. 2. This promise of life was in or by Christ Jesus, 2 Tim. i. 1. This promise laid a foundation for the hope of it, Tit. i. 2, and iii. 7. The father gave the son to have life in himself, John v. 26. Hence it is said, in him was life, John i. 4. And he was made after the power of an endless life, Heb. vii. 16. Accordingly, he is called *the life*, 1 John i. 2. John xiv. 6, the resurrection and the life, John xi. 25, the eternal life, 1 John v. 20, and the eternal life who was with the father and manifested to us, 1 John i. 2. He is also termed the prince of life, Acts iii. 15, and the bread of life, John vi. 35, 48, 51, 53. The grace of God reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ, Rom. v. 21, and eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus

Christ, Rom. vi. 23. This eternal life is in or by God's son, 1 John v. 11. He gives eternal life, John x. 28, and gives it to as many as the father hath given him, John xvii. 2. This eternal life is expressly said to consist in knowing God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, John xvii. 3. Hence the word of Christ were spirit and life, John vi. 63. He had the words of eternal life, verse 68. God's commandment was life everlasting, John xii. 50. Compare 1 John i. 1. As eternal life consists in the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, so persons are said to enjoy it by believing, John iii. 15, 16; 1 Tim. i. 16. They had it upon their believing, and it abode in them by continuing to believe, John iii. 36: v. 24; vi. 40, 47, 53, 54, and xx. 31; 1 John v. 12, 13. The Jews thought that in their Scriptures they had eternal life, yet would not come to Christ, or believe on him, that they might have it, John v. 39, 40. On the contraty, they judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life by rejecting the gospel, Acts xiii. 46. Accordingly, the apostles turned to the Gentiles, and as many of them as were ordained or disposed for eternal life, believed, verse 48. The Jews had all the words of this life preached unto them, Acts v. 20. The apostles in preaching were to some a savour of life unto life, and to others of death unto death, 2 Cor. ii. 16. In reaping the gospel harvest among the Jews, they gathered fruit unto life eternal, John iv. 36. And whosoever lost his life for Christ's sake kept it unto life eternal, John xii. 25, for at the end of the age those who endured to the end were saved. Those who believed not went away into everlasting punishment and the righteous into life eternal, Matt. xxv. 46. Compare John v. 29. And the receiving of the Jews again shall be as life from the dead, Rom. xi. 15.

Such is a very brief review of all the texts where

life, and everlasting life are spoken of in the New Testament. On the whole of them I would now propose a few queries and remarks. If eternal life refers to the happiness of heaven in a future state, how is it accounted for, that *eternal death* is never spoken of as its counterpart to the wicked in a future state? Everlasting punishment is mentioned, Matt. xxv. 46, as the counterpart of everlasting life, but everlasting or eternal death is not once named in the Bible. But it is well known that eternal death is a favorite expression with many preachers. But it may be said, "everlasting punishment, everlasting fire, everlasting destruction, are mentioned in the Bible, and are not these equivalent to eternal death?" We answer no; and it will be seen in the next Section that such expressions have no respect to punishment beyond this life. But again, if eternal life refers to the happiness of heaven in a future state, how happens it that it is so often spoken about as a thing enjoyed in this life, and dwelling in persons by believing in Jesus? It is defined to consist in knowing God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. It could not only be enjoyed here, but people could enter into this life, which is the same as entering into the kingdom of God. Further, though eternal life is sometimes spoken of as future, and an object of hope, yet I do not find it spoken of as an object expected after the resurrection of the dead, or once mentioned as equivalent to the happiness to be enjoyed in the resurrection state. It is rather spoken of as something expected after the end of the Jewish age, during the age of the Messiah, or the "world to come." The promise of eternal life in this age to come, was made to Christ's disciples; for when our Lord spoke, the old dispensation had not then vanished away, and it was not until it ended,

that our Lord's kingdom came in its glory and power. It was a matter of hope to his disciples, for then they were to enter into life, or into the joy of their Lord. But again, the term life is used both in the Old and New Testaments to express happiness or enjoyment.' We have seen that it is used very often to designate the spiritual or moral life of believers.—Those who believed were not condemned, did not perish, but were saved. Those who did not believe, of the Jewish nation, and those believers who did not endure to the end did perish. The wrath of God abode on them, and his wrath came on them to the uttermost at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jews, by putting the word of God from them, judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life. The apostles turned to the Gentiles, and thus the kingdom of God was taken from the Jews, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. I would only add that this eternal life is expressly said to be enjoyed *in the world to come.* This world or age to come, we are told by orthodox authors above, began at our Lord's first advent, and shall be completed at his second coming. How then is eternal life to be enjoyed if the world to come ends, according to their own explanation of this expression?

In regard to the word everlasting being associated with the term life it can occasion no serious difficulty. The term everlasting is also applied to the kingdom of Christ, and the gospel of this kingdom is called "the everlasting gospel." But surely no one ever thought that the gospel is to be preached to the endless ages of eternity. Is it said, "How could the apostles enjoy everlasting life in the kingdom of God here, seeing a few years terminates the existence of every man in the world?" I answer this by asking,

how could Samuel abide before the Lord forever? Or how could the slave serve his master forever? In short, how could the priesthood be enjoyed by Aaron and his sons forever? Or the land of Canaan be an inheritance to Israel forever? But these remarks I have merely suggested for consideration. Allowing they have no weight, the grand subject of our investigation stands unaffected; for all must admit the remarkable fact, that frequent as eternal life is mentioned, yet no sacred writer ever ventured to speak of eternal death; and it is with the application of this word to future punishment we are at present chiefly concerned.

In Luke xx. 34—36, we have *this world*, and *that world* mentioned, or this age and that age or state.—But as it requires no particular consideration, it is unnecessary to transcribe it. I would only remark, that *aionos* here cannot mean endless duration or forever. It would not do to say the children of this forever marry, and the children of that forever do not marry.

SECTION VII.

ALL THE PLACES WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE USED TO EXPRESS THE DURATION OF PUNISHMENT, PARTICULARLY CONSIDERED, IN WHATEVER WAY RENDERED IN THE COMMON VERSION.

MATT. xxv. 46. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." See also verse 41, which refers to the same

persons, and the same punishment. Before we proceed to consider these words, we beg leave to make some general remarks on chapters xxiv. and xxv., together.

1st. What is contained in these two chapters is one continued discourse of our Lord's, addressed to his disciples. The word *then*, in verse 1, of chapter xxv., shows this. "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." When was the kingdom of heaven to be likened to this? The answer is found in chapter xxiv., which is at the coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem. It is further manifest from chapter xxvi. 1, "And it came to pass when Jesus had finished all these sayings." And what sayings could these be but all the sayings contained in the two chapters?—For it will be difficult to point out any change of subject from verse 4, of chapter xxiv., to the end of capter xxv. That this discourse was delivered to the disciples alone, is plain from comparing chapter xxiv. 1—4, with chapter xxvi. 1, 2.

2d. The whole of this discourse is in answer to the questions put by the disciples, verse 3, of chapter xxiv. "Tell us when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world," or age? This supposes he had said something about his coming, which we find was the case from the last verse of chapter xxiii. The questions put, were to obtain information about this coming, and the signs whereby they might know its approach. All allow the coming, in chapter xxiv., refers to our Lord's coming at the end of the Jewish dispensation, but many contend that the coming, in chapter xxv., refers to his coming at the end of this world. But the word *then*, so clearly marks the connexion of these two chapters, as to forbid such a supposition. Nor can

any man point out where our Lord left off speaking of the one coming, and began to speak of the other. He mentions his coming, chapter xxiv. 3, 27, 30, 37, 39, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, and in chap. xxv. 6, 10, 13, 19, 27, 31, as one; nor can any one doubt that the same coming, chap. xxv. 31, is the same as that, chap xxiv. 30—35, from the language used and the circumstances mentioned. See also Matt. xvi. 27, 28; Luke ix. 26, 27; Mark viii. 38, and ix. 1. From verse 4 of chap. xxiv. our Lord proceeds to answer the disciples' questions, and points out particularly the signs whereby they might know that his coming was at hand. These I need not particularize.

3d. What has led many to conclude, that chap. xxv. refers to a day of general judgment, is, overlooking the connexion between the two chapters, marked by the word *then*, in verse 1 of chap. xxv. and not noticing how exactly the three parts of chap. xxv. correspond to and illustrate three things inculcated on the disciples from verse 42 to the end of chap. xxiv. These I shall briefly notice, hoping the reader will compare the passages I refer to. Notice, then,

1st. That our Lord inculcates on his disciples the duty of *watchfulness*, in view of his coming. See chap. xxiv. 42—44. Let the reader then compare these three verses with chap. xxv. 1—13, and we think he must be convinced, that the parable of the ten virgins was spoken to illustrate, and enforce on his disciples this very duty. Hence the parable ends with these words, expressive of its object—"Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh;" which are almost the very words in which he stated the duty of watchfulness in chap. xxiv. 43, 44. Who can dispute this? But admit it, and Matt. xxv. must be given up as referring

to a day of general judgment at the end of this world.

2d. In chap. xxiv. 45, our Lord also inculcates on his disciples the duty of *faithfulness*, in view of his coming. Let the reader compare the second division of chap. xxv. from verse 14—31, and we think he must also be convinced, that the parable of the talents, was spoken by our Lord to illustrate and enforce the duty of faithfulness upon them. Here I ask every candid reader to say—Is it not the same Son of Man which is mentioned in both chapters? Are not the servants to whom the goods were delivered the same as in chap. xxiv. 45? Is not the faithfulness and unfaithfulness of the servants the same in both? And is not the coming of our Lord to reckon with them the same coming in both? Who can with any show of reason deny these things? But who can admit them, yet contend that this second part of chap. xxv. has any relation to a day of general judgment?

3d. In verse 46, and to the end of chap. xxiv. our Lord states the consequences which would result, according as they were found watchful and faithful, or the contrary. Now, compare this with the third division of chap. xxv. from verse 31—46, and all must see how exactly the one corresponds to the other. In the one, he states what rewards and punishments would be awarded, at his coming, to his servants; and in the other, he goes on to illustrate this, by what may as justly be called the parable of the rewards and punishments, as the two former are called the parables of the ten virgins and talents. This agreement of chaps. xxiv, xxv, is not an accidental thing, but the effect of design, and clearly marked by the word *then*, with which chap. xxv. begins; but it is not noticed by most readers from the improper division of our Lord's dis-

course into chapters and verses. Our Lord no more ends his discourse, chap. xxiv. than Paul ends his Epistle to the Romans, chap. iv. If the question is asked, *when* shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins? The answer is found in chap. xxiv. 42, 44, 46, 50, where his coming is repeatedly mentioned, and in verse 34 is expressly said to be during that generation. We ask every candid man, Is not the Son of Man, mentioned chap. xxv. 31, the very same Son of Man as is spoken of in chap. xxiv? And is not his coming in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, the same coming and glory as is mentioned chap. xxiv. 30? It was this perfect agreement of the three divisions of chap. xxv. to the three things stated in chap. xxiv. which changed my views of this subject many years ago, so that they are not influenced by any change of opinions since.

Keeping these general remarks in view, let us attend to the words—"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." The first question is—"Who shall go away into everlasting punishment?" The context answers, the goats, verse 33, whose conduct is described, verses 41—46. The wicked and slothful servants, verses 24—29. The foolish virgins, verses 10—12. And the evil servants, chap. xxiv. 48, 49.

2d. Let us ask—What everlasting punishment were these persons to go away into? Answer: the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, verse 41. The outer darkness, verse 30. See also verse 10, and chap. xxiv. 51, all of which, it will be allowed, refer to the same punishment. In the first part of this Inquiry it has been shown, that by the devil and his angels, verse 41, our Lord referred to the unbelieving Jews and opposers of Christianity. In the In-

quiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. it has been also shown, that *fire* is a figure often used in Scripture for temporal punishment, and is the same here, as *hell fire* in other places. In both Inquiries it has been shown, that the term *everlasting*, is applied to the punishment which the Jews are now enduring. In confirmation of these things, comp. Luke xiii. 23—31; Matt. viii. 11, 12; xiii. and xxii. 13.

3d. Let us ask again—When were these persons to go away into everlasting punishment? The answer from the context evidently is—"When the Son of Man came in his glory," verse 31. Well, when was this? Not at the end of this material world, for not a word is said about this in the two chapters. It was when the Lord of the servants came to reckon with them, verse 19. When the bridegroom came, verse 10. At the time when the slothful servants were not looking for him, chap. xxiv. 41—51. And at the time referred to, verse 44, when he said to his disciples, "be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." Christ's father only knew of this day, verse 36. It was to come like a thief in the night, or like the flood on the old world, verses 37, 43. But it was certainly to come during that generation, verse 34. Then he was to reward every man according to his works, which exactly agrees to some going away into everlasting punishment, and some into life eternal.

But it will be asked—What throne of glory did Christ sit on when he came to take vengeance on the Jewish nation at the end of the age? The Greek in chap. xxv. 31 is, *tote kathisei epi thronou doxes autou*, and is the same which Matthew used, chap. xix. 28, and is rendered in both places by Dr. Campbell in the same way. The whole verse he renders thus—"Verily I say unto you, that at the renovation, when

the Son of Man shall be seated on his glorious throne, ye my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel." Here let the reader turn to the last Section, and read the quotations made from Dr. Campbell and Macknight on this verse.—These writers have shown, that the coming of Christ was at the end of the Jewish dispensation, that the throne on which he sat was the throne of his mediatorial kingdom, and the judging then to take place, the ruling or governing men with his truth. His throne was no more a literal, visible throne, than were the twelve thrones of the apostles. The time when, the nature of the throne, and similar language used in both cases by Matthew, show, that there is no reference to a day of general judgment, as is generally supposed. If Matthew used this language, chap. xix. 28, as these writers explain it, by what fair rule of interpretation do we give the same words, chap. xxv. 31, such a very different interpretation? Men now would feel indignant at having their words interpreted in such an arbitrary and capricious manner. What right, then, has any man to affirm, that the Son of Man's coming in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, refers to a day of general judgment, when the same writer, in the same book, has used the same or similar language, where it is manifest he is speaking of Christ's coming at the end of the Jewish age or dispensation? It is well known, that the term rendered *angel*, simply signifies a messenger of any kind; and it is allowed, on all hands, that angels are mentioned as connected with our Lord's coming at this period. See Matt. xxiv. 30, 31, and xvi. 27; Mark viii. 38; ix. 1, and xiii. 26, 27; Luke xxi. 27. The angels being then mentioned, is a confirmation, not an objection to the views ad-

vanced. See Whitby and Macknight on Matt. xxiv. who show the angels to be human beings.

But it will be objected—How, upon your views, can it be said, "and before him shall be gathered all nations?" Answer; the phrase "all nations" occurs twice before in this very discourse of our Lord's, chap. xxiv. 9, 14. "And ye shall be hated of *all nations* for my name sake. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto *all nations*, and then shall the end come." What end shall come? Evidently the end of the Jewish age, verse 3, which took place about forty years after our Lord delivered this discourse. During this period the gospel was preached among all nations, Mark xiii. 10, or throughout the Roman empire, which was then called the whole world, Luke ii. 1. See Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Col. i. 6, 23; Rom. i. 8, and x. 18. Judea was then a province of the Roman empire. That the apostles preached the gospel throughout the Roman empire, and were hated of all nations, no one disputes. We have then found in this discourse, the *all nations* to be gathered before Christ seated on his mediatorial throne. It is obvious, that whoever contends for a literal gathering together of all nations before him, ought also to contend, that every individual of the same *all nations* heard the gospel, and that every individual of them hated the apostles for Christ's name sake. But how in this case could they have had any converts to their doctrine? And no separation could have taken place, for all the nations would have been goats. The gathering together of all nations before him, need not be extended to more than such as heard the gospel, and professed it, some of whom did, but others did not bring forth its proper fruits. This limited view, we think is favored by the scope of our Lord's discourse.

For example, it was not the whole world, or all nations, but the *kingdom of heaven*, or Christ's professed disciples, who are likened unto the virgins, verse 1.—Nor was it to all nations, but to his *own servants*, Christ delivered his goods, verse 14. See also chap. xxiv. 42—46. And the replies made to the king by both goats and sheep, proceed on the ground that they were both professors of his name. But it is not absolutely necessary to confine the sense of this phrase; for, since Christ sat down on his glorious throne, he has been judging the nations of the world in righteousness, and such of them as would not serve him, he has broken in pieces like a potter's vessel. But let us inquire,

1st. Were there are any false professors in the kingdom of heaven when our Lord came at the end of the age. This needs no proof, for it is notorious, and universally admitted. There were foolish virgins, and servants who had not improved their talents. See also chap. xxiv. 10—12. And see the epistles, for complaints made of professors by the apostles. When Christ came to reckon with his servants he found some faithful and watchful, but others saying, my Lord delayeth his coming, counting him an hard master, smiting their fellow servants, and eating and drinking with the drunken. When he ascended to God's right hand, he was like a man travelling into a far country to receive unto himself a kingdom. See Luke xix. 12—27. At the end of the age, he returned, having received his kingdom, and called his servants to an account of their conduct during his absence. Before he went away, he commanded all to be faithful and watchful. But such was the state in which he found the kingdom of heaven when he returned. The whole slumbered and slept. Many were found neither looking for, nor

prepared for his coming. He had forewarned them of the consequences, and this third division of chap. xxv. sets forth the rewards and punishments which he then awarded to them. That much is said in the New Testament, to excite their hopes and fears relative to our Lord's coming at the end of the Jewish dispensation, no one, we think, will question. But where do we find what our Lord promised or threatened, fulfilled, but in this very discourse, and which goes to show that the view I have given of it is substantially correct?—But let us ask,

2d. Did a separation take place at the end of the Jewish age, between true and false professors in the kingdom of heaven, or, between the goats and sheep? Nothing can be more certain. This separation is described under other figures, such as a separation between chaff and wheat, Matt. iii. 12. Tares and wheat; and good and bad fishes; Matt. xiii. 30—48. See also Matt. viii. 11, 12, and xvi. 27, 28. Christ's fan purged his floor. The net then was drawn to shore, and the good and bad fishes separated. The tares were gathered to be burned, and the wheat into the garner. Indeed, none but such as endured to the end were saved; Matt. xxiv. 13. What is said about separating them as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, is in allusion to the business of a shepherd, and to Christ who is called the good shepherd, and his true disciples, sheep. His placing the sheep on the right hand, and the goats on the left, is probably in reference to judicial trials, as may be seen above in a quotation from Jahn. The rule of judgment was, offices of kindness performed towards Christ's disciples. The similarity of the language used, chap. xxiv. 45, 46, and chap. xxv. 34—41, deserves the reader's notice. In the first it is "blessed is that servant whom his Lord,

when he cometh, shall find so doing." And in the last, "come ye blessed of my father inherit the kingdom," &c. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 15—18, and Rom. xvi. 3, 4, as actual examples of such kind offices performed. But let us ask,

3d. What everlasting punishment and eternal life did those persons go away into after this separation? 1st. What everlasting punishment did the goats go away into? The same as the everlasting fire, verse 41, which in the one verse is expressed figuratively, and in the other plainly. This everlasting fire was prepared for the devil and his angels, or the Jews, and the opposers of Christianity. To them was the Gospel first preached; by them it was first rejected, and for them this punishment is said to have been prepared. But observe, it is not, like the kingdom for the righteous, said to have been prepared from the foundation of the world. What then was the everlasting fire or punishment prepared for the Jews, the avowed enemies of Christ and his Gospel, for these false professors are said to go away into the same punishment. I answer, the kingdom of God was taken from them; and I shall show on 2 Thess. i. 9, that they have been punished with everlasting destruction from *the presence of the Lord* in his worship and service. Blindness of mind, hardness of heart, and dreadful temporal judgments have come on the Jews for nearly eighteen hundred years. In the Jewish use of the term *everlasting*, it may well be called an everlasting fire or punishment. It is, then, agreeable to fact, those of the kingdom of heaven not found watchful and faithful, or bringing forth the fruits of the Gospel, did go away into, or have suffered a similar punishment. Where are now the seven churches of Asia? Indeed, where is any church throughout what was then called the Roman empire?

Their candlestick is removed out of its place. Those nations have been given up to blindness of mind and hardness of heart very similar to the Jews, and that they have suffered severe temporal judgments none will deny. The most inveterate superstitions prevail among them. The nations who would not submit to him, or who have corrupted his religion after being favored with it, have suffered similar punishment, and it has been of such long continuance, that it may well be called everlasting. Christians who enjoy the gospel, tacitly allow, both Jews and heathen to be in a miserable condition, by their attempts to convert them to the faith of Christ. But after all the time and labor and money spent to effect this, the situation of those nations is not much more hopeful than that of the Jews. If there be any blessedness in believing the gospel, and being governed by the laws of Jesus, then there is misery in unbelief, superstition and wickedness; and both on a national and individual scale, the nation or individual in such a condition can but be miserable.

2d. But what life eternal did the righteous, or the sheep, go away into? As the everlasting punishment, verse 46, is the same as the everlasting fire, verse 41, so is the life eternal, verse 46, the same as the kingdom said to be prepared from the foundation of the world. What kingdom, then, was this? What kingdom could it be, but that which was taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, called often the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God in the New Testament, and the kingdom likened unto the ten virgins, verse 1. The kingdom which Jesus went away to receive for himself when he ascended to the father, and on the throne of which he is represented as sitting, and calling his servants to an account when he return-

ed. This kingdom is called the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and does not consist in meat and drink, but in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. That such a kingdom, or life eternal, was expected, is evident, for our Lord said, Luke xxi. 31, 32. "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." And verse 28—"When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth near." This kingdom, or life eternal, might be said to be prepared for them from the foundation of the world, for it was included in the promise of Christ from the beginning.

It is an unsupported assertion, from any part of our Lord's discourse, that this kingdom, or the life eternal enjoyed by the righteous, is the happiness of the heavenly state. But the view I have given is amply supported both by it and other parts of Scripture. It is the same as going in with the bridegroom to the marriage, verse 10. And entering into the joy of their Lord, 21, 23. And to inherit this kingdom is to enjoy all the blessings and privileges of it. See Rom. xiv. 17; Matt. viii. 11, 12, and Luke xxii. 29, 30. My views, then, accord with the nature of the kingdom Christ received from the father, the throne on which he sits, and his rule and government in it, and which, at the period called the end, he is to deliver up to God the father, 1 Cor xv. 24—28. To this kingdom he had a right to invite all those who endured to the end, chap. xxiv. 13, and to punish all those who said, "we will not have this man to rule over us."

It has long been considered one of the strongest arguments in favor of eternal misery, that the same Greek

word is rendered here *everlasting* and *eternal*, and applied both to life and punishment. It is hence inferred, that if the punishment is not endless, neither is life. Universalists do not admit this, for they adduce some texts where everlasting is used in the same verse, where it is allowed by their opponents that it is used both in a limited and unlimited sense. But if my views are found correct, it puts a final end to this argument and mode of reasoning, for everlasting is not used in either case to express endless duration. A brief sketch of my views of the phrase "everlasting life," has been given above, and some things may just be noticed here in confirmation of them.

1st. It is concluded by many, that this chapter contains an account of the end of this world, and the day of judgment. But why is such a conclusion drawn? for certainly, though it speaks of everlasting fire, everlasting punishment, and life eternal, it gives no intimation that these are suffered or enjoyed in another state of existence. The general usage of the word everlasting is against such a conclusion; and it is beyond all debate, that this term is applied in other texts to the temporal punishment of the Jews, which no one believes to be of endless duration. Besides, the whole scope of our Lord's discourse shows, that here the word everlasting is used to express the duration of this very punishment, and is the fulfilment of what Daniel predicted, chap. xii. 2, considered above. This is confirmed from the word *kolasis*, here rendered *punishment*. Parkhurst says it comes from *kolazo*, to punish, and it comes from *cla* in the Hebrew, which signifies *to restrain*. This punishment, then, is for the purpose of *restraining* the subjects of it, and not, as we are sometimes told, for "the glory of divine justice in their eternal misery;" or, that "the happiness of the right-

eous may be sweetened in seeing the smoke of their torment ascend up forever and ever." The sense given by Parkhurst to the above words is supported by their Scripture usage. See 1 John iv. 18; Acts iv. 21; 2 Peter ii. 9. On this last text see my answer to Mr. Sabine. The word rendered punishment in both places, is a confirmation of my opinions.

2d. The life eternal, verse 46, and the kingdom the righteous are called to inherit, verse 24, are the same, or the life eternal is to be enjoyed in this kingdom. It has then been shown above, that eternal life was promised to Christ's disciples in *the world to come*, or the age of the Messiah, which certainly agrees to this passage. This passage is the fulfilment of what Christ promised, Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30; Matt. xix. 29, considered above. The father appointed to Christ a kingdom, and he having returned from receiving it, his faithful followers enjoyed the life or happiness of it. They entered into the joy of their Lord, and shone forth like the sun in the kingdom of their father.

It may be objected—"How could it be said, 'these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal,' if endless duration in a future state be not meant, for such persons could only live a few years in this world either to suffer or enjoy?" See this objection noticed page 307. I would add here, that it is certain, everlasting is applied in Scripture both to punishment and enjoyment, when all allow endless duration is not meant. Why not so here, when we have seen that eternal life was to be enjoyed in *the world to come*, which is to end? That the present punishment of the Jews is called everlasting, no one can dispute, and we think has been shown, is the punishment referred to in this very passage. If the Jews, while in Canaan, enjoyed it successively in

in their generations as an everlasting possession, and now cast out of it, endure in their generations an everlasting punishment, why not also believers enjoy eternal life, in a similar way, in the age of the Messiah? This life, I conceive, is not called eternal on account of its endless enjoyment by the individuals, but from its being a life connected with the kingdom of Christ, which is called an everlasting kingdom, which is to endure until the end, or resurrection of all the dead, and then mortality shall be swallowed up of life in being forever with the Lord. It is everlasting in a similar sense as the kingdom itself, or the gospel of this kingdom, which is called the everlasting gospel.

Is it further objected—"That Matt. xxiv. has a double meaning, first, in the destruction of Jerusalem during that generation, and second, in the dissolution of this world and a day of general judgment?" But why not give it twenty meanings and accomplishments as well as two? And why not say the same of all the discourses which our Lord delivered? Our Lord declared, "All these things shall come on this generation," but did he intimate that they were again to be fulfilled in a still higher sense at a day of general judgment? No, nothing like this is said by him; and without proof, such an objection does not require a serious refutation. At any rate, let the evidence for this be produced, and we will give it a serious consideration.

2 Thess. i. 9. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." We have considered this passage, with its context, very fully in the Universalist Magazine, vol. v. beginning at page 157. To it we refer the reader, and shall here only give an abridgment of our remarks. Let us consider,

1st. Who the persons were to whom Paul alluded when he said, "*who* shall be punished with everlasting destruction." Most people say—"All the wicked." The apostle and the Thessalonians knew who they were to their painful experience, for they were the persons who *troubled* them, verse 6, and from whom their persecutions arose, verse 4. Who, then, *persecuted* and *troubled* them? The Thessalonians were persecuted by their own countrymen. 1 Epist. chap. ii. 14, 15. But their persecutions chiefly arose from the unbelieving Jews, as is evident from Acts xvii. 5—7. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 15. The whole New Testament shows this. But it is evident from the context. Let the question be asked—Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction? The answer is found, verse 8. Those "that know not God, and obeyed not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Was not this the case with the Jews? Comp. John xvi. 3. God was to recompense tribulation, and to take vengeance on those that knew not God; and God's vengeance on the Jews is expressly called—"the days of *vengeance*, that all things which are written may be fulfilled," Luke xxi. 22. Comp. also Luke xviii. 7, 8; Rom. xii. 19. The connexion between the 8th and 9th verses clearly shows, that the vengeance to be taken on them that know not God, and who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, refers to the same persons, and the same punishment. And in verse 6, it is said, it is a righteous thing with God "to recompense *tribulation* to them;" and which our Lord calls, Matt. xxiv. 29, "*great tribulation*, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." Comp. verse 21. By troubling or persecuting Christians, the Jews were to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and bring upon themselves such tribula-

tions. Accordingly, it is said, verse 5, "which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God."—What is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God? The answer is, verse 4, the persecutions and tribulations which the Thessalonians endured. But this only provokes the question—A manifest token of the righteous judgment of God upon whom? The answer evidently is, verse 6, upon them that troubled the Thessalonians, which we think beyond all dispute, were the unbelieving Jews. Comp. Philip. i. 28, where it is called "an evident token of perdition" to them. By pursuing such a course, the Jews fulfilled what our Lord predicted, and brought upon themselves all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. See Matt. xxiii. 34—36, and 1 Thess. ii. 16.

2d. Let us now consider *at what time* such persons were to be punished with everlasting destruction. If the persons were the unbelieving Jews, the answer is given already in the above remarks. It was at the destruction of Jerusalem. But let us examine the context and we shall see this confirmed. The particular time specified is, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." Well, when was this to be?—It is answered by the context, when he recompensed tribulation to the Jews who were the troublers of the Thessalonians, and was not this at the end of the age, when God's wrath came upon them to the uttermost? This period is expressly called, *the day when the Son of Man is revealed*, Luke xvii. 30. Comp. Rom. ii. 5; 1 Peter i. 5, 13; iv. 13—19, and v. 1—5. This revelation is said to be "from heaven," and the angels are said to be connected with it, which exactly corresponds to what is said, Matt. xxiv. 30, 31. It has been shown that the term *fire* is used as a figure to express God's judgments on the Jewish nation. See Mal. iv.

1, &c. But there are some things mentioned in the context which were to take place at the same time, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven," which are irreconcilable with the common views entertained of this passage, but which strongly confirm the explanation I have given of it.

1st. At this same time the Thessalonians were to obtain *rest*, for it is said, "and to you who are troubled, rest with us, *when* the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." The rest referred to was evidently rest from the persecutions they were enduring. See the context, and compare 2 Cor. vii. 5, and Acts ix. 31. If the day of judgment be the time referred to, then the Thessalonians are not to obtain rest from their persecutions until it arrives. But surely this cannot be, for the day of judgment is not yet come, and they have long ago found rest where all the weary find rest, and hear no more the voice of the oppressor. Did the Thessalonians then find rest at the period when Jesus was revealed to take vengeance on the Jewish nation? Yes; this is a matter of history as well as fact. Our Lord, referring to this very period, said to his disciples, "When these things begin to come to pass, then lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh," Luke xxi. 28. Those who endured to the end, were not only saved from the calamities which came on the Jews, but the Christians were at rest from their persecutions throughout the Roman empire. They were too much in trouble themselves then, to trouble others.

2d. It is obvious that the Thessalonians were to obtain rest at the same time that God was to recompense tribulation to their troublers or persecutors. This is plain from verses 6, 7, quoted together: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation

to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us." And when were both these to take place? It is immediately added, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." If the end of this world be referred to, it is a plain case, that God is not to recompense tribulation to those who troubled the Thessalonians until this period, nor until then are the Thessalonians to obtain rest. But the common belief is, that the wicked are punished from the moment of their death until the day of judgment, and are to be punished forever after it. The common view of this text therefore must be abandoned.

3d. But the time when all this was to take place, is further designated, verse 10, which Macknight renders thus: "*in that day* when he shall come to be glorified through his saints, and to be admired *by all the believers;* and by you, because our testimony was believed by you." Was Christ glorified then through his saints when he yielded vengeance on the Jews, in the destruction of their city and temple? We presume no one questions this. They obtained rest, they lifted up their heads, and shone forth like the sun in the kingdom of their father. If believers glorified God when Saul, the persecutor, was converted to the faith, (Galations i. 23, 24,) how much more when they saw their persecutors generally removed, and "the son of man coming in his kingdom," Matt. xvi. 28, compare Rev. xv. 3, 4, and xi. 17. But all these things will be confirmed by considering

3d. The *nature* and *duration* of the punishment here mentioned. 1st. Let us notice the *nature* of the punishment. It is called "destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." It will not be disputed, that the punishment described in these words, is the same as the righteous judgment

of God, mentioned verse 5, and called tribulation, verse 6 and the vengeance to be yielded, verse 8.—Nor will it be questioned, that the punishment described in all these verses is to be inflicted on the same persons. They are to be *punished*, and punished with *everlasting destruction*, yea, with everlasting destruction from *the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power*. It is easily perceived, that a correct understanding of the nature of the punishment depends on the meaning of the phrase

Presence of the Lord. What then is the scriptural sense of this expression? It may just be observed, that the phrases *face of God*, and *face of the Lord*, are the same in Scripture as *presence of God*, and *presence of the Lord*. By *the presence of God*, or *presence of the Lord* in Scripture, is sometimes meant his being every where present. Thus David says, Ps. cxxxix. 7, 8, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit?—Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; If I make my bed in hell, (*Sheol*,) behold thou art there," &c. Admitting, for argument's sake, that hell is a place of endless punishment, how could the wicked, even there, be out of God's presence? Yet in this passage the persons are said to be punished with everlasting destruction *from the presence of the Lord*. Again; I find the phrase *presence of the Lord* refers to heaven, or the dwelling-place of the Most High. Christ is said to have gone "into heaven, now to appear *in the presence of God* for us," Heb. ix. 24. And it is said, Luke i. 19, "I am Gabriel, that stand in *the presence of God*." But how could the wicked be punished with everlasting destruction from God's presence in this sense? For surely no one will say that they ever were in heaven, and like Gabriel, stood in the presence

of God. But again, the phrase *face of God*, or *presence of the Lord*, refers to some places where people met to worship him, and where he met with and manifested himself to them. Thus Jacob, at Penuel, Gen. xxxii. 30, says, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." See Job i. 6—12, and ii. 1—7, for examples of the same phrase, *presence of the Lord*. Unless there was some particular place where God was manifested in the days of Cain, how could it be said, "and Cain went out *from the presence of the Lord* and dwelt in the land of Nod (or vagabond, as in the margin) in the east of Eden?" Gen. iv. 16, and verse 14, it is added by Cain, "behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth: and from thy face shall I be hid."

It is very evident, that *the presence of the Lord* was in a peculiar manner among the children of Israel.—See Exod. xxxiii. 14—17, compare Isai. lxiii. 9, and Psalm li. 11. The tabernacle in the wilderness, and the temple at Jerusalem, were considered by the Jews as the peculiar residence of Jehovah. There he abode, and there they performed all their religious services to him. Jehovah was the God of the Jews; their land his land, and the temple there was considered the place of his immediate presence. As this has an important bearing on the passage before us, we must give it a little more of our attention. In the temple at Jerusalem, God is said to dwell between the cherubim, Psalm lxxx. The show bread placed there, is called "the loaves of the presence or faces." And viewed in this light, the following texts have great beauty and force. "Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise unto him with psalms. Serve the Lord with gladness, come before his presence with singing. Glory and honor are

in his presence; strength and gladness are in his place." Psalm xcv. 2, and c. 2; 1 Chron. xvi. 27. But that the land of Judea, and particularly the temple, was considered by the Jews as the place of God's peculiar presence, is manifest from Jonah i. 3. "But Jonah rose up to flee into Tarshish, from the presence of the Lord." Where he believed the Lord's presence to be, we learn from chapter ii. 4. "I am cast out of thy sight; but I will look again toward thy holy temple." In short, whether the Jews were in their own land, or in captivity, when they prayed or performed acts of worship to God, their thoughts and their faces were directed towards their temple at Jerusalem.—See in proof of this, Dan. vi. 10; 1 Kings viii.; Psalm v. 7.

But there are still some passages which deserve our particular notice, because they clearly decide what is the meaning of the phrase, *presence of the Lord*, in the passage before us. The first is, 2 Kings xiii. 23. "And the Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion on them, because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and would not *destroy* them, neither *cast them from his presence as yet*." This was spoken of the Jews; and just notice, that God speaks of *destroying them*, and *casting them from his presence*. What he here says, that *as yet* he would not do to this people, in the following passage we find that he did do. 2 Kings xxiv. 20, "For through the anger of the Lord, it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah until he had *cast them out from his presence*, that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon."—The same is repeated, Jer. lii. 3, which I need not transcribe. God's presence was enjoyed by the Jews in Judea, and in their temple service. To be cast out of God's presence, is to be banished from Judea into

captivity, and from all the privileges which the Jews enjoyed in their land, and temple worship. This was the same as *destroying them.* They were thus destroyed, or cast out of God's presence, for seventy years in their captivity at Babylon. But they were brought back from this captivity, and again enjoyed God's presence in their own land. At the time Paul wrote the words before us, the time was drawing near when they were to be again cast out of God's presence, and dispersed among all nations. Of the Jews Paul spoke. He adopts the very language of the above passages, used in speaking of their former captivity, to describe the judgments of God which awaited them in their being cast out of their land, their city and temple destroyed, and they destroyed with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. The Jews now, are just as certainly *destroyed from the presence of the Lord*, as they were during their seventy years captivity. How then can any man affirm that Paul, in this passage, by destruction from the presence of the Lord, meant either annihilation or eternal misery? If the Scriptures are allowed to interpret themselves, Paul only describes the temporal destruction and banishment of the Jews, and in the very language by which the prophets had described their former punishments. It is added by the apostle, "and from the glory of his power," or as some render it, "his glorious power." Should this be understood of Jehovah, the God of Israel, it is certain his glorious power was displayed among the Jews. Should it be understood of Christ, it agrees with what is said of him; for at the destruction of Jerusalem he is said to have come in the glory of his father; and he was then to be seen coming with power and great glory, Matt. xvi. 27, and xxiv. 30. But it will be said, How is

this destruction of the Jews called an *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord, if it refers merely to temporal calamities? I shall now,

2d. Notice the duration of their punishment. It is the word *everlasting*, which is here, and in other places, applied to punishment, which leads many good people to conclude, that it is in another world, and is of endless duration. But so far from this being true, this very application of the word everlasting, is a strong confirming circumstance in proof of the views advanced; for, first, it has been shown at length, that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, are rendered everlasting, and in a great many instances at least, are used to express a limited duration of time. But, second, these words are rendered everlasting, and applied to the very temporal punishment which the Jews have endured for eighteen hundred years, and are still enduring. For example, it is said, Jer. xxiii. 39, 40. "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, *and cast you out of my presence: and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten.*" See my Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c., on this passage. Compare also Deut. xxviii. 37, and xxxi. 17, 18; Hosea ix. 17; Jer. xx. 11, and xxiv. 9. What only remains to be accounted for is, why is this temporal punishment of the Jews called everlasting, both by the prophet, and by Paul in this passage? This we think is easily and rationally accounted for. Paul was a Jew, and was speaking of Jews and their punishment. What could be more proper, than to speak of their punishment in the language in which it was described by their own prophets, as a destruction, and an everlasting destruction from the presence of the

Lord? The Jews were familiar with the language of their Scriptures; but what Jew ever understood, that to be cast out of God's presence, was to be cast into misery in a future state; or, that the word everlasting, applied to it, expressed its endless duration? No man, we think, will assert this. It is of no consequence how Christians have understood either the phrase, *presence of the Lord*, or the word *everlasting*, for ages past, but the question is—How did the Jews understand this language? In the Jewish use of the term everlasting, their present punishment is called everlasting with stricter propriety of language, than many other things to which they were accustomed to apply it. No punishment they ever suffered before is called everlasting, which might have been done to their seventy years captivity, for this term, we have seen, expresses the duration of a man's life. Should the present punishment of the Jews, then, end to-morrow, its continuance for eighteen hundred years might be called everlasting. But how long it is yet to continue, God only knows. For this length of time they have been cast out of their land, and have not enjoyed God's presence. The Christian church is God's house now, but how few Jews have come to enjoy his presence here, facts show. All the exertions made to convert them to the gospel of Christ, is little else than lost labor. The veil is on their hearts, and all attempts to remove it have as yet proved abortive.—They are *an everlasting reproach*, and *a perpetual shame* among all the nations of the earth. What nation ever suffered so long and severe a destruction as they have done, yet remain a distinct and numerous people? And what nation ever enjoyed such privileges, and yet remain so long a blinded and unbelieving people? But their punishment is to end; for as

certainly as God has concluded them all in unbelief, so he is to have mercy upon all. Their everlasting destruction is not of endless duration.

1st. Is it objected—"How could the Jews, who persecuted Christians at Thessalonica, suffer this punishment, seeing they lived so far distant from Jerusalem?" Answer: it could have made no difference in the case, had they lived at the poles; for at the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews were banished Judea, and have not been allowed to return to this day. Even the few Jews in Judea now, do not enjoy the presence of the Lord. They live there without a temple, an altar, or a sacrifice, and mourn over the long desolations of their city and temple; dragging out a miserable existence in hopeless expectation that their Messiah is yet to come. But many of the foreign Jews suffered at the destruction of their city and temple, for it was at the feast of the passover, when they were generally assembled there, that Titus surrounded the city and they could not escape.

2d. Is it objected—"The presence of the Lord means his gracious presence at the day of judgment, and being destroyed from his presence, being banished to hell at this period?" Answer: let this be proved, for assertions prove nothing. Not a word is said in the whole context of the passage, about *a day of judgment*, or God's *gracious presence*. Such gratuitous assertions do not deserve notice, and especially in view of the illustrations of this expression given from the Scriptures.

3d. Is it objected—"Your views of this passage do not agree with the coming of Christ mentioned chapter ii. 1, of this epistle; for it is his coming at the day of judgment, and you have interpreted his coming, in chapter i., of his coming at the destruction of Jerusa-

lem?" Answer: whoever will consult Whitby, may see that he interprets Christ's coming, in chapter i., of the day of judgment, but passes it very slightly; but he enters at large into the proof, that Christ's coming, chapter ii. refers to his coming to destroy Jerusalem. Whitby then shows, that chapter ii. is in accordance with my views of chapter i. But whoever wishes to see these things treated more at large, must consult the Magazine referred to above.

Matt. xviii. 8. The "everlasting fire" here mentioned, is the same as hell fire, verse 9, for they are used as convertible expressions; and the same as everlasting fire, Matt. xxv. 41. See Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c., for an illustration of this text, and which has been also noticed in the present Inquiry. It requires no further attention.

Jude 7. "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." That the suffering the vengeance of eternal fire here, has no reference to punishment in a future state appears to me evident from the following considerations:

1st. From comparing 2 Peter ii. 6, where nothing is said about eternal fire, but only that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, with the people together, are said to be condemned with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly. Had the people gone to endless misery, would Peter have omitted this important part, and mentioned only the destruction of the cities with the loss of their lives, as an example to ungodly men?—We cannot very readily admit this.

2d. By comparing verses 5, 6, 7, together, Jude says, that the people to whom he wrote knew that

Sodom and Gomorrah suffered the vengeance of eternal fire. But I ask how they could know that they suffered in a future state of existence? For the history of the event, nor any other part of Scripture could give them such information. Compare Zeph. ii. 9. But they could know, that the people of Sodom and Gomorrah suffered temporal misery, for this is plainly made known.

3d. Jude says they were set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. But how could they be an example if this refers to punishment in a future state? For an example to others must be visible to be of any benefit to them. Their destruction with the cities, are an example, for these are facts allowed by sacred and profane writers, Jewish and heathen. See Philo, Josephus, the Apocryphal writers, and others, who all mention those events. It is allowed by many intelligent men, that nothing is said in the Old Testament about eternal punishment. The cities of the plain burnt for many ages, which sufficiently entitled this fire to be called "the vengeance of eternal fire." This fire might be called *eternal*, in the same or similar sense, as the desolation of certain cities and places were to be perpetual or everlasting. See, among others, the following places: Ezek. xxvi. 20, 21; xxxv. 9; Jer. xviii. 15, 16; xxiii. 40, and li. 39. This has been shown above. I may add, that *puros aioniou* might be rendered "of the fire of the age." The apostle then says, that they suffered the vengeance of the fire, or punishment of the age; fire being a figure for punishment. Or simply, they suffered the vengeance of the fire of old.

4th. Whitby and others, who believed the devil to be a real being, maintain, that he is not suffering, nor will suffer the torments of hell until after the day of

judgment. Why then send the Sodomites there before him? God must be very merciful to the devil, to excuse him so long a time from eternal misery, yet send all the Sodomites there when he burnt up their city. But we think neither the doctrine concerning the devil, nor eternal misery, have been properly examined, or such opinions would all be discarded.

Jude 13. "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Peter states, for substance, the same, second epistle, ii. 17, which has been noticed in my answer to Mr. Sabine, to which I refer the reader. There it has been shown that the apostle referred to the Jews, and the darkness they are now in; and that it may be said to be forever, in the Jewish usage of this expression. That their present punishment is called everlasting, we think has been proved from several texts above.

Mark iii. 29, has been considered in connexion with Matt. xii. 31, 32, above, and requires no further notice.

Heb. vi. 2. "Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." It requires no proof, that Paul was addressing himself to believing Hebrews.—At verse 11, of chapter v., he said, that he had many things to say to them concerning Melchisedec, hard to be uttered, or not easily understood by them, because they were dull of hearing, or slow in learning. According, in verses 12—14, he reproved them thus:—"For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of

righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." By "the oracles of God," Paul evidently referred to the Old Testament Scriptures, particularly the law given at Sinai. See Acts vii. 38, and Rom. iii. 2. He could not refer to the New Testament Scriptures, for, at the time he wrote, they were not all written; nor does it appear that this appellation is ever applied to them. By the *first principles*, must be meant, some things in the Old Testament, for they are said to be the *first principles of the oracles of God*. This is evident from the word *stoiheia*, rendered, first principles, Gal. iv. 3, 9, where, instead of *elements* in the text, our translators have put *rudiments* in the margin. In Col. ii. 8, 20, they have rendered this same word *rudiments*, and have put *elements* in the margin. The same word is rendered *elements*, 2 Peter iii. 10, 12, which we think could be shown, refers to things belonging to the Jewish dispensation. It is apparent from these texts that it signifies the elements, rudiments, or first principles of the oracles of God, or things which belonged to the Jewish dispensation.—These were suited to the world, while in a state of childhood; but after Christ had come, ought to have been laid aside. But many Jewish converts to Christianity turned back again to these week and beggarly elements, whereunto they deserved again to be in bondage. This was the case with the believing Hebrews: for instead of being in advance of the Gentile converts, having had the *rudiments* in their hands from their childhood, they needed even to be taught them again. They were babes, preferring milk to strong meat, or those rudiments, to being skilful in the word of righteousness, and having their senses exer-

cised to discern both good and evil. See chapter v. 12—14, and compare Gal. iv. 1—4.

Let us now notice the first two verses of chapter vi. "Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection." In the margin it is, "*therefore, leaving the word of the beginning of Christ*," which evidently refers to the first principles of the oracles of God, chapter v. 12, the word *therefore* shows that the apostle drew his inference from what he had just stated, chapter v. 12—14. It could not refer to the word of the beginning of Christ, taught by him or his apostles, for surely Paul would not command them to leave what Christians are commanded to hold fast and continue in. See 1 John ii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 1—4. Nor, was this the beginning of the word of Christ, unless we affirm that nothing is said of Christ in the Old Testament. But to him gave all the law and the prophets witness. Besides, could the apostle mean to tell the Hebrews, that they could not go on unto perfection unless they left the beginning of the word of Christ? This, we think, is impossible.—But, by leaving the first principles of the oracles of God as taught in the Old Testament, they could only go on to perfection, for it was by adhering to those rudiments, after Christ had come, that their progress in knowledge had been retarded. Instead of *leaving* them, they began to lay them again as a foundation, or, returned to those weak and beggarly elements, deserving again to be in bondage to them. Is it asked, How can the different articles here specified, and which they are desired not to lay again as a foundation, be the first principles of the oracles of God, as taught in the Old Testament? I shall now attempt to show this, by briefly noticing those articles.

1st. "*Not laying again the foundation of repent*

ance from dead works." That repentance was required under the Old Testament dispensation needs no proof, and therefore this part occasions no difficulty.—Probably a reference is here made to that which was enjoined on the great day of atonement, Lev. xvi. 21, 22, 29, 30.

2d. "*And of faith towards God.*" But why not faith towards Christ, if the apostle did not refer to the principles of the Old Testament? It is well known that the faith of persons during that dispensation chiefly respected God. See Heb. xi. 6; John xiv. 1. This part can occasion no difficulty.

3d. "*Of the doctrine of baptisms.*" Christian baptism is always spoken of in the singular. But, when the Jewish baptisms or washings are mentioned in the New Testament, they are spoken of, as here, in the plural number. See as examples, (in the Greek,) Mark vii. 4, 8. And Paul, in this very epistle, chapter ix. 10, calls them *divers baptisms.* This so plainly belongs to the Old Testament, that we may conclude all the other things refer to the same dispensation.

4th. "*And of laying on of hands.*" This article can occasion no difficulty, for it is well known that laying on of hands was common under the Jewish dispensation, and that on various occasions. It is no objection to my view, that this and some of the other things were also done under the gospel dispensation.

5th. "*Of the resurrection of the dead.*" This is commonly understood of the general resurrection.—But why should it? If the preceding articles refer to things under the old dispensation, why not this and the article which follows? Then, certain persons were raised from the dead, and that the apostle refers to

them in chapter xi. 35, is indisputable. Elijah raised the widow's son of Zarephath, 1 Kings xvii. 20—24. Elisha raised the Shunamite's son, 2 Kings iv. 32—36. These with other instances of the power of God, were a great confirmation of the truth of Judaism, and confirmed the faith of believers in it; yea, exhibited the excellency of faith in God during that dispensation.—Compare Heb. xi. 35, with 1 Kings xvii. 24. And whatever promoted their faith toward God, led to repentance from dead works. But, that the term *anastasis*, rendered *resurrection*, was used among the Jews to express a revival in various ways, is shown by Dr. Campbell, previously quoted. The restoration of Israel is described as raising dead dry bones to life, Ezek. xxxvii. 1—14. And with equal propriety might the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Pharaoh be called a resurrection from the dead.—Hence they said to Moses, Exod. xiv. 11, "because there were no graves in Egypt hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" That by the dead, in Scripture we are sometimes to understand not those actually dead, but only being in danger of it. And a deliverance out of such a state, a resurrection, is allowed. See, among other texts, the following: Genesis xx. 3; 2 Sam. xix. 28; 2 Cor. i. 8—10; Rom. xi. 15; John v. 28, 29.

6th. "*And of eternal judgment.*" That the term judgment is used to express *temporal* judgment in Scripture needs no proof. That the ancient Jewish religion was established by great temporal judgments is indisputable, as the five books of Moses show. And that the judgment of God on the Egyptians, when Israel were delivered from their bondage, is called *eternal* or *forever*, is expressly declared. Hence it is said, Exod. xiv. 13, "For the Egyptians whom ye have

seen to-day, ye shall see them again no more *forever*." See above, on the word *olim*, as used in the Old Testament. Accordingly the phrase *krimatos aioniou*, eternal judgment, may be rendered, of the judgment of the age, or, the judgment of old. In this sense, we have seen *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios* used in Scripture. I may just add, that the context seems to confirm the view given of this passage. In verse 3, it is said, "*and this will we do if God permit.*" Do what? Let it be asked. Answer: "go on unto perfection," as stated verse 1. If the first principles, spoken of were such as belonged to the Old Testament, it was altogether unnecessary for Paul to teach them, for this would be laying them again as a foundation. But it was highly proper for him to go on to teach what would render them perfect or full grown men, seeing they were so deficient in the knowledge of Christ Jesus. This in fact he did in this very epistle, for a great part is spent in pointing out to them the reality of that, of which the Jewish law was but a shadow. But what was to prevent his doing this, for he says, "this will we do if God permit." This, Paul purposed to do if God gave him opportunity, and if his purpose and labors were not frustrated, by their total apostacy from the faith before his letter came to them. Hence his fears about this in verses 4—9. See also chapter x. 23—39.

Rev. xiv. 11. "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night." And xix. 3, "And again they said, Alleluia, and her smoke rose up forever and ever."—And xx. 10, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." It would be idle to show

that these passages have no respect to punishment in another state of existence. No well informed man would urge them as proof of such a doctrine; for it is plain, that the punishments were in this world, where the time is measured by day and night.

Such are all the texts in the Bible, where *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios* are used, in whatever way rendered by our translators. Not one text has been omitted to our knowledge, and the reader having the whole ground before him, may examine it for himself. The texts on which dependence is placed, proving the doctrine of endless punishment, we have fully considered, and to spend time with others is unnecessary.

SECTION VIII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON OLIM, AND AION, AND AIONIOS, RENDERED EVERLASTING, FOREVER, &C. THROUGHOUT THE BIBLE, WHETHER APPLIED TO GOD, TO LIFE, OR PUNISHMENT.

If these terms are ever used to express endless duration, all seem to be agreed that they express the endless duration,

1st. *Of God.* Indeed, it is from their being applied to him, who is without beginning or end, that it is concluded they express endless duration when applied to other things. This point, then, requires to be examined with modesty and care. It would ill become me, to speak with dogmatical confidence on such a

subject. All I claim is, that what has occurred to me be considered impartially, and it may lead to a more complete investigation of the subject. There is no dispute, nor can there be any, about the endless existence of Jehovah. The only point about which a question arises, is, are these terms intended to express his endless duration when so applied? If they do, it must, I think, be allowed, that it is the subject to which they are applied which gives them this extent of signification; and it is certain beyond a doubt, that they are often used in Scripture to express a limited duration; yea, sometimes a short period, such as a person's life time. Besides, does it follow, that because God is infinite, that words must derive an infinite signification when applied to him? If they do, why confine it to the words before us? Why not also say, that when the term *good* is applied to God, it must always mean an infinite degree of goodness? which, if true, puts an end to the doctrine of eternal misery, for it is expressly said, "the Lord is *good* unto all." So in regard to other terms being applied to him. But what leads me to think that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, used to express duration when applied to the divine being, were not intended to designate his endless duration, are the following things:

1st. From the original native sense of these terms. Lexicon writers seem to be agreed, that they signify eternity, not from their natural native sense, but from the subjects to which they are applied, and the sense of certain passages requiring such an application of them. They all allow, that they not only signify limited duration, but are used to express this in Scripture. I would therefore query, whether we ought to take it for granted, that certain passages in which such words are used, require us to understand them as ex-

pressing endless duration? May not these passages be misunderstood? And, when duly considered, we may see that they do not require such a sense affixed to these terms. Is it correct reasoning to infer, that terms expressing limited duration, cannot be applied to God without changing their meaning from a limited to an infinite signification? Why may not these terms, which are certainly used to express all the ages of the world from its beginning to its end, be also used when applied to God, to express, not his endless duration, but the period of his dispensations and dealings with men through Jesus Christ, throughout all the generations of it. For example, when God is called "the king eternal," we have seen above, by a quotation from Macknight, that it simply signifies king of the ages, or of all the ages or dispensations of this world.

2d. Supposing then these terms, when applied to God, do not express his endless duration, but all the period of his dispensations with men in this world, there is a propriety and congruity in all their applications throughout the Scriptures. They are then used to express a longer or shorter period, as the subject of the writer required. They express the period of a man's life-time, the duration of any one of the dispensations under which men have been placed, or all the ages of the world from its beginning to its end. Accordingly these terms are used in a variety of ways to express limited duration, as is universally allowed. To understand them as expressing endless duration would make the inspired writers in many instances speak the most palpable absurdities and contradictions.

3d. If these terms, when applied to God, are used to express his endless existence, I beg leave to ask, why qualifying explanatory phrases are added by the sacred writers, as is so frequently done? I shall explain my-

self about this. For example, when *olim* is used to express time past, it is not only rendered of old, the days of old, ancient, ancient years, former years, but is explained to mean many generations, the years of many generations, and from the beginning. Again, when it is used to express future time, we have also the following explanatory phrases given us concerning it: all thy days, throughout your generations, throughout all generations, to all generations, from generation to generation, many generations, every generation, the tenth generation, and a thousand generations. Besides, it is also limited or qualified by the duration of the sun, moon, host of heaven, and days of heaven. Had this word signified endless duration, all must have seen the propriety of adding such explanations when it was used to express a limited duration, for this was necessary to prevent misunderstanding. But what need was there to add the same or similar explanations when this term is applied to God? Why not let it have its full unqualified meaning, if it really signified endless duration? But the sacred writers make no distinction, for they add the same restricting, qualifying expressions, when it is applied to him, as when speaking of any thing else, as seen above from the passages where *olim* occurs. Indeed if this word signified endless duration, it was necessary to give such explanations when used to express a temporary duration, but surely altogether unnecessary when speaking of God. If persons will have it, that the subject to which *olim* is applied determines whether it is to be understood in a limited or endless sense, let them account for the fact, that such qualifying phrases are used when it is applied to God. What was their use or intention in such a connexion? Yea, I ask, ought we not rather to have had some phrases showing that *olim* when applied to God was

to be understood in its most unlimited sense? This was necessary, seeing the word did not signify endless duration of itself, was applied so often to express limited duration, and was attended with such qualifying phraseology in so many instances. At any rate, when *olim* was applied to God, why were not such restricting phrases omitted? This would have been leaving the subject to which it is applied, to determine the extent of its meaning without any drawback from such limiting phrases. Were such phrases introduced for no purpose? But if introduced for the purpose of limiting or explaining *olim* in the one case, no candid man will question, but they were introduced for the same purpose in the other. For example, the priesthood of Aaron is called an everlasting priesthood, but this is explained by the phrase "throughout your generations." So in other instances. Well, when it is said of God, "his mercy is from everlasting to everlasting," it is added, by way of explanation, "his righteousness unto children's children." Psalm ciii. 17. Again, when it is said "thou art from everlasting," this is again explained by the words, "thy throne is established of old." Psalm xciii. 2. And is it said "thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom," we find it explained thus, "and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." Psalm cxlv. 13. And is it again said, "his mercy is everlasting," it is again added as an explanation, "and his truth endureth to all generations."—Give me leave to ask, if everlasting meant endless duration, why are all these qualifying explanatory phrases added? Had the word *olim*, rendered everlasting, meant endless duration, and such qualifying phrases only been added when it was applied to things of a temporary nature, this would only be guarding the application of the term from abuse. But we see that

such explanatory expressions are given when it is applied to God. Now if the term was intended to express his endless duration, why was this the case?—Why not omit them in all instances where he is spoken of, and only use them where this term is applied to things of limited duration? Had this been done, it would have shown, that the inspired writers did use a word which expressed endless duration, and judged it proper to guard its misapplication by such qualifying expressions. But if we consider the word *olim* as expressing limited and not endless duration, all the qualifying phrases used are proof that in this sense the sacred writers wished themselves to be understood by their readers. Is the question then asked, what is the limit of time expressed by this word? So far as I can see it is expressed by the qualifying expression "throughout all generations."

4th. The very repetition of *olim*, and rendered forever and ever, seems to show, that it was not designed to express God's endless duration. If forever, by itself, did express an endless duration of time, why add another forever to it. This was altogether superfluous, for twenty forevers added, could not add to endless duration. How could adding another forever, make the first forever, or both taken together, an endless duration of time? Add as many forevers as you please to one another, if the first expresses a limited period, the number added must still fall infinitely short of eternity. They may make up a very long period of time, but still one which must come to an end. But I will leave it for candid men to consider, if the very adding one forever to another, does not fairly imply, that the sacred writers never intended to express endless duration by this mode of speaking. Many people seem to think, that "forever and ever," expresses end-

less duration, but if duly considered we think it leads to the reverse conclusion, for the very repetition of "forever" implies, that the first forever was of limited duration. This is confirmed, from considering that forever and ever, is indiscriminately applied to things which are to end, and to God himself. Besides, the sacred writers give us the same explanations, or qualifying phrases in both cases when they use this language. In short, whether forever and ever is applied to God, or to things of temporary duration, they guard us against understanding it as meaning a proper eternity. It is throughout all generations and as long as days shall be measured by the host of heaven.

5th. But if "forever," or, "forever and ever," is used to express endless duration, why speak of a period beyond this? Thus in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, other words are joined with it, which effectually restrict its meaning. Thus, Exod. xv. 18. *The Lord shall reign forever and ever and further.* Dan. xii. 3. *They shall shine as the stars forever and further.* Mic. iv. 5. *We will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and beyond it.*— See Unitarian Miscel. vol. ii. p. 33. The translators of this version seem to have thought, that there was a period beyond forever, and forever and ever.

I am aware, that to all this it will be objected— "Does not David say, Psalm xc. 2, 'even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God,' and does not this express the endless existence of God, both as to past and future? Is it not the same as if he had said, 'thou art from infinite duration that is past to infinite duration to come?'" Plausible as this appears, when these words of David are attended to, they rather go to confirm the views which have been advanced. Hallet, in his Notes, vol. i. pp. 75, 76, thus writes: "Psalm xli.

13. 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting, and to everlasting. Amen, and Amen.' I am apt to think, that many English readers suppose, that the words *from everlasting*, signified a duration that was past in the days of the psalmist. But, on second thoughts, the English reader will perceive that this cannot possibly be. The psalmist here expresses his desire that God may be blessed. But it is impossible to desire, that God may be blessed heretofore. To say, *blessed be God in past ages*, would be as ridiculous as the advice a late divine has given Christians, to pray that the one catholic church may be built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. The text then must be rendered, *blessed be the Lord God of Israel from* age to age; i. e. from this time forth, throughout all ages. Every one will allow, that the Hebrew word *olim*, here rendered *everlasting*, does frequently signify *an age*, or *generation*. Nor will any one object to this interpretation of the word *and from everlasting* and *to everlasting;* as if this would hinder us from rendering the expression, *from age to age;* when he shall consider that the word *and*, in such like expressions is redundant or superfluous in our language, whatever grace it adds to the Hebrew phrase. Thus the Hebrew expression, 2 Chron. ix. 26, is literally to be rendered, 'from the river *and* unto the land of the Philistines.' Our translators have rendered the Hebrew particle by *even;* 'from the river *even* unto the land of the Philistines.' It would have been as well if they had dropt it quite, and had said, 'from the river to the land of the Philistines.' See also 2 Chron. xxx. 5.—So also the passage of the Psalm under consideration may be rendered, *blessed be God from age even to age*, or, more simply, *from age to age*. In the same sense

the expression is to be understood, Psalm ciii. 17.—'The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting,' or rather from age to age, i. e. from this age to the next, and so on throughout all future ages. In the same manner, I conjecture, we must understand this same expression, Psalm xc. 2, which I would render thus: 'Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth or the world, and from age to age thou art God.'"

But it is likely to be further objected, "That if 'forever and ever' is not admitted as expressing the endless existence of God, is not this attempting to do away his endless existence?" I would answer, by no means; for his endless existence is altogether independent of these terms being applied to him, and why give a wrong meaning to Scripture in support of this doctrine? Is there no other way of establishing the eternity of God's existence but by means of these words? If there had not, we should hardly think the inspired writers would have used such qualifying language in connexion with them, when they applied them to God. Instead of modifying, they would have added some additional phrase, to show that they wished to be so understood.

We think no considerate man will affirm, that *aion*, or *aionios*, of the New Testament can express endless duration, unless *olim* of the Old, expresses such a duration. The New Testament writers in no case intimate that *olim* of the Old Testament signifies limited, but that *aion* and *aionios* of the New, mean eternal duration. On the contrary, they use these words in several instances as a correct expression of what is to be understood by *olim* in the Old Testament.

2d. But it is further supposed, that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, rendered everlasting, must mean endless dura-

tion when applied to *life*; and "everlasting life," is considered to be the never ending life, enjoyed beyond this mortal existence. If we have counted correctly the phrases *zoen aionion*, *zoe aionios*, *zoes aioniou*, and *aionios zoe*, occur just forty-three times in the New Testament. They are rendered everlasting life, eternal life, life everlasting, and life eternal; but all mean the same thing, as is evident from comparing in the Greek John xvii. 2, with verse 3, and other passages. This phraseology is peculiar to the New Testament, as it occurs only Dan. xii. 2, and in reference to the age of the Messiah. Had it referred to a life common to believers under the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, why was this the case? If it means, as most Christians believe, the life or happiness of the heavenly state, Old Testament saints must have known it, for they looked for this. See Heb. chap. xi. But they are never said to have it, to have it abiding in them, or even to hope for it, which is often said of New Testament believers. Besides, though all the prophets bore witness to Christ, yet he is never called "eternal life" by any of them, as by the New Testament writers. The reason seems to be, that this title referred to his manifestation in the flesh; hence John calls him, "that eternal life which was with the father, and was manifested unto us." This agrees to its being said, that "eternal life" was to be enjoyed in "the world to come," or "the age of the Messiah," which orthodox critics say above, "began at his first advent and shall be completed at his second coming." The word *everlasting* added to *life* proves nothing about its enjoyment in a future state or its endless duration, for the New Covenant is called everlasting. The kingdom, reign, and priesthood of Christ, are called everlasting. But does this mean endless duration? This kingdom

Christ received, and he is again to deliver it up to God the father. Hence the Jews say, "that the kingdom of the Messiah shall return to its first author." And shall not his priesthood, called an everlasting priesthood, cease when he shall have none to intercede for, and his reign end, when all are subdued, and God be all in all? His priesthood shall not pass away like that of Aaron's, nor his kingdom like other kingdoms of this world, but shall continue while sun and moon endure. The life enjoyed in this kingdom is called everlasting life, and the consolation in it everlasting consolation. In short, I conceive that all the everlastings of which the Scriptures speak, stand in some shape or other connected with God's dispensation of love and mercy to man through Jesus Christ. The ages or everlastings began with it, and shall terminate when Christ hath subdued all things, and the last enemy death is destroyed. Hence the state after this, does not appear to me to be described in Scripture by the expression "everlasting life," but by other words and phrases. For example—The dead are said to put on incorruption or immortality. Mortality is then to be swallowed up of life. They cannot die any more, but are equal unto the angels, being sons of the resurrection, their inheritance is *incorruptible* and *fadeth not away*, and they are to be (*pantote*) forever with the Lord.

The phrase "everlasting life," occurs only once in the Old Testament, but is of frequent occurrence in the New. But why was this the case, and why is it spoken of as a thing enjoyed upon believing in Jesus, and as connected with his reign or kingdom which is to end, if it designated the life and enjoyment beyond the resurrection of the dead? Besides, it is set in contrast with the everlasting punishment, into which

the Jews and others have gone for nearly eighteen hundred years, as shown above. It never can be proved, that it is ever contrasted with eternal death, or a punishment after the resurrection of all the dead. But this ought to have been its contrast, and contrasted as often as everlasting life is contrasted, if the common doctrine be true. Were the inspired writers so perfectly indifferent about the eternal death of their fellow creatures, that they did not think it worth while once to mention it? They were surely not so much alarmed about this as many modern preachers are, for eternal life and eternal death are their constant themes, and they cannot deny, that these expressions are used by them in contrast to describe the endless felicity and misery of men in a future state. But where did they learn this? Not from their Bibles, for it contains no such contrast. Such men must presume a great deal on the ignorance and credulity of their hearers, who think to make their sayings pass for the declarations of Jehovah.

3d. The term everlasting, is also applied to punishment; and it is confidently affirmed, that it expresses the endless duration of it. The places where it is so applied, are few in number, and can easily be counted by the reader, as they have all been laid before him. Such of them, on which dependence is placed in proof of the doctrine of endless punishment, have been fully and particularly considered. For example, Matt. xxv. 46, and 2 Thess. i. 9, the strong holds of this doctrine, have been razed to the foundations. It has been proved, we think, that so far from those passages teaching the doctrine of *endless* punishment they do not even teach a punishment beyond this life. If these two texts fail in supporting it, it is useless to attempt its defence from any other part of Scripture.

To conclude. We have attempted to examine the common doctrines of the devil and eternal punishment with all the candor and fairness we could command. It has resulted in the fullest conviction, that these doctrines are not taught in Scripture, but are the production of the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness with God and which cometh to naught. Persuaded, the more the Scriptures are examined this will the more clearly appear, we have published our views on the subject; hoping it will be pursued by others who have more time, and better talents, to throw additional light on it. We can sincerely say that we have sought after the truth, and from the love of truth, for this only can stand, when all human devices in religion shall fall. If we have not found the truth, but have embraced error, we hold ourselves in readiness to attend to whatever can be said on the other side. Truth can never suffer by calm, candid discussion, but error shuns the light, deprecates investigation, and is ever ready to cry *heresy*, and that *the church is in danger*.

END OF PART II.

PART III.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE POSSESSIONS OF DEVILS, MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the first part of this work it has been shown, that the terms *devil* and *satan*, in the Bible, do not designate an *evil spirit*—an angel who fell from heaven.—We shall now inquire, if the *devils* with which persons were supposed to be possessed, are *evil spirits* who fell with him, as many believe. It is often said in the New Testament, that certain persons were possessed with a *devil*, and one man declared, that he had a legion of them within him. But no such statements are to be found in the Old Testament, nor do we find any such things in the present day. In the apostolic age, these *devils* were supposed to inflict madness and other disorders on men, yet no person imputes the same evils to them in the present day. Are such *devils* all dead? Have they lost their power to inflict such disorders? Are they all turned good devils? or have we been mistaken in what is said in the New Testament about them?

It is very certain, the word *devil* misleads the English reader. The Greek words *diabolos*, *daimon*, *daimonion*, are all rendered, in the common version of the New Testament, by this word *devil*, and in the plural *devils*. But the last two words are essentially different in meaning from the first, and in modern translations are rendered *demon*, and in the plural *demons*. The

three words are never used to express the same being or thing by the sacred writers. They never intimate that any person was possessed with *diabolos*, the *devil*. The devil is spoken of as *one*, and is only used in the plural number when speaking of human beings. But the *demons* are spoken of as *many*, and were cast out of persons. *Diabolos* is never said to be cast out of any person. This marked distinction between the *devil* and *demons* is lost in our common English version: for *diabolos*, *daimon* and *daimonion* are all rendered by our English word *devil*.

If the terms devil and satan do not designate an angel who fell from heaven, the presumption is, *demons* are not angels who fell with him. It is very certain no such thing is taught in the Bible, and if not found there, how came it to be known, that demons are fallen angels? Some have supposed, *demons* to be the mongrel breed of some angels with the daughters of men. Others, as a race of malignant and mischievous spirits; and we shall see they are deemed by some the ghosts of deified dead men, mere imaginary beings, and originated in the vain imaginations of the heathen. It is certain, the Bible no where says that God created them, or gives us any account of their origin. Dr. Campbell says, "What the precise idea of *demons*, to whom possessions were ascribed, then was, it would be, perhaps, impossible for us, with any certainty, to affirm." This, in one sense is true, for the Bible gives us no precise idea of *demons*, as real beings. But if they were ideal beings, created by the imaginations of men, we may, perhaps, ascertain this to be a fact, which is sufficient on the subject. It is evident, the New Testament writers speak of *demons*, and of persons being possessed with them, not as a new thing under the sun, but as a popular and common

thing, and speak in the common language of the age about them. They speak of *demons, the devil and satan*, of the *god mammom*, of *transmigration*, and other things, without saying how such opinions originated, or, whether they were true or false. To have corrected all the false opinions of the age, would have been an arduous and vain work, and had they not spoken of things in the common language of other people, they could not be understood, but would have subjected themselves to the charge of vanity and affectation. They did then, what we do now, speak in the popular language of the day. We speak of St. Anthony's fire, St. Vitus' dance, and of the rising and setting of the sun, and people would smile at the man who refused to do so.

The question with us now ought to be, what is the best course, to arrive at true views about the *demons*, and the possessions of them in the New Testament? I answer, to examine first, what the Old Testament teaches us about *demons, evil spirits*, etc. The Old and New Testaments were written principally by Jews, and among Jews; and he who would correctly understand the latter, must make himself acquainted with the former. The Old Testament is the best dictionary, to learn the language of the New. That person is ill prepared to understand the New Testament about *demons*, who has not consulted the old, respecting them, *evil spirits*, etc. And in his examination of both, ought to consider himself a Jew; living among them in past ages; and passing with them through all their changes; going with them into their captivities; and returning with them to their own land, with all the heathen notions they had imbibed. The shortest and surest way which we can take, to arrive at the truth about the *demons* mentioned in the New Testament, is

to examine the Old. The inquiry must be, did the Jews learn from their scripture, that *demons* were *evil spirits* or *fallen angels*? If they did not, the question will then arise, from what source did they derive the opinions about *demons*, and the possessions of them, which were entertained by them in the days of our Lord? Were they a new revelation from God? If not, were they invented among themselves? And if not, did they learn them from the heathen with whom they had intercourse? Until we have examined these questions, we are not prepared to form correct views of *demons* and the possession of them in the New Testament. What then does the Old Testament teach us respecting *demons*, *evil spirits*, etc.? What does the apocryphal books teach us on this subject? And what do we learn from the heathen opinions about demons, as given by writers respecting them? We adopt this course of investigation as the best we can devise, and shall pursue it as far as is practicable. I shall then examine,

1. *The Old Testament.* Dr. Campbell remarks, that "*diabolos* is always in the Hebrew, *tsar*, *enemy*, or, *satan*, *adversary*; words never translated in the septuagint *daimonion*. This word on the contrary, is made to express some Hebrew term, signifying idol, pagan deity, apparition, or, what some render *satyr*." That *demons* are mentioned in the Old Testament we shall now proceed to show. The first passage is,

Deut. xxxii. 17. "They sacrificed unto *devils*, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods, that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not." The Jews never sacrificed to *diabolos*, *the devil*. But they often sacrificed to *demons*, to idols, or strange gods. And the names of those strange gods are often mentioned in the Old Testament as could be easily shewn. What those *demons*, or false

gods were we have noticed elsewhere ; and here may notice once for all, they always stand condemned in scripture. And what the Jews sacrificed to them, we shall see immediately. But it will be asked, who, or what were those *demons* to which they sacrificed ? We shall see afterward, that they were the *ghosts* of dead men deified, or, imaginary beings, whom they raised to the honour of being gods.

The second text is Psal. xci. 6. Thou shalt not be afraid—" for the pestilence that walketh in darkness ; nor for the destruction (*daimonion,*) that wasteth at noonday." Some render it—"*from accidents, and the demon at noonday.*" Some say, it was "a maxim with Pythagoras, that *Heroes* should be worshipped at noon." It is added "in warm countries where people go to sleep at noon, all disturbances were to be avoided ; and *evil spirits* are there, at that time of day as much talked of, as with us they are in dark nights, and perhaps for the same reason." But as the original now stands, it affords no solid ground for any *demon* or *evil spirit*, nor does anything like this appear in our English version. This must be obvious to all. The demon, was some natural evil.

The third text is Psal. xcvi. 5—" for all the gods of the nations are idols (*daimonia,*) but the Lord made the heavens." Here it is expressly said—"*all the gods of the heathen are demons.*" In the original it is, *alilim, vanities, nothings.* In other places they are called "*lying vanities.*" And God says, Isai. xlv. 5—"*I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me.*" But the words of Psal. xcvi. 5, are also found in 1 Chron. xvi. 26, and there *alilim* is rendered *eidolon, idols,* and not *daimonia.* Levit. xix. 4 is rendered in a similar way. And *alilim* in Job xiii. 4, is rendered " of no value." But

if *demons* are *evil spirits*, how can it be said they are *vanities*, *nothings*, or, *of no value*, if they both possessed men and tormented them? No; if this was true, they were *something* of a very important nature to the persons who suffered from them. But this passage ought to settle the question about *demons* in the New Testament, and especially as Paul declares the same thing, that an "idol or *demon* is nothing in the world." To suppose them real beings, *evil spirits*, is not only contrary to the Scriptures, but admits that they can work something very like miracles, in tormenting mankind. Some of the Jews thought that Beelzebub was the worker of the miracles in our Lord, which if admitted goes to invalidate all true miracles in proof of a divine revelation. If "all the gods of the nations were *demons*," I ask, were persons possessed with heathen gods?

The next text is Psal. cvi. 37. "Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils" (*daimoniois.*) Here we are told, that they "sacrificed their sons and their daughters," and sacrificed them to *demons*, to *idols*, to *false ideal gods*, the names of which can be found in other places of the Old Testament. And yet, it is believed by many, that these imaginary beings did possess and torment men, from what is said in the New Testament. But the Jews, nor any one else, could not have believed this, had the Old Testament scriptures been their guide, and had not imbibed the heathen notions about *demons*. It is plain, the ancient Jews, had very different views about demons, from their descendants in the days of our Lord, for they speak of them very differently.

The next text is Isai. xiii. 21. "But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell

there, and *satyrs* (*daimonia,*) shall dance there.' The Hebrew word here is *soír,* which some say means *hairy beings.* But the whole verse seem' intended to describe the desolate condition of Babylon, that all kinds of wild birds, and beasts should inhabit it. See also Isai. xxxiv. 14, where *demonia* is also rendered *satyr,* but requires no further notice, for it is similar to the one just mentioned. If demons are fallen angels, it seems they are *hairy beings,* have their abode with wild beasts at Babylon, and dance there. But who believes this? or, who can believe such *demons* possessed men, and inflicted madness and other disorders upon them?

The next text is Isai. lxv. 11. "But ye are they that forsake the Lord, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop (*daimonio,*) and that furnish the drink offering unto that number." *Gad* is put in the margin, *for that troop* in the text, and for *that number,* is put *Meni.* Jerome says, it is uncertain, whether *Gad* or *Meni* was originally translated *demon.* Some have thought an allusion is here made to some Egyptian custom. And Dr. Spencer thought the most natural sense was, *that they prepared a table to Gad, and a drink offering to Meni.* But be this as it may, it is plain enough, the *troop* referred to was not a troop of fallen angels, or *evil spirits,* but of heathen divinities, *demons,* or false gods, and agrees with other passages already noticed. It is well known, the *demons,* or false gods of the heathen, were numerous, and that they spread a table for them to eat and drink at. See on 1 Cor. x. 19—22, below.

Len. xvii. 7, says—"And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto *devils,* after whom they have gone a whoring." I might have passed over this text, for the word in the septuagint is not *daimonia.* In the

Hebrew the word for *devils* in this text is—*leshiodim*, which the seventy render by the word *mataiois*, *vain gods*. Some think Pan is the God referred to ; and according to Herodotus, statue makers and painters, "make the image of Pan with a she goat's face, and a he goat's legs ; and that a goat and Pan were in the Egyptian language called *Mendes*." Be this as it may, there is no reference in this passage to wicked spirits or fallen angels, but to heathen gods, idols, mere *nonentities*, or *nothings* in the world. If any one supposes the Jews sacrificed to *devils*, meaning *fallen angels* or *wicked spirits*, it is a great mistake. I shall show presently, from a high orthodox writer, that the Jews did not know about evil spirits until their captivity in Babylon. And the fact deserves notice, that since that period, the Jews have not been given to idolatry.

Having adduced all the texts in the Old Testament which speaks of *demons*. what conclusions are we to draw from them ? I answer, we cannot conclude that *demons* were fallen angels, or wicked spirits, for not a hint of this is given in any one of them. But we may conclude on the best of evidence that *demons* were heathen gods, imaginary beings, who could not do good or evil ; and if gods, are called on by the true God, to show this by doing either of these things. We may also safely conclude, that the Jews before they went to Babylon, had heard of and known something about *demons*, for they had sacrificed even their sons and daughters to them. And if Josephus may be credited, Solomon not only knew about *demons*, but had found out a root, the smell of which expelled demons. But it was not until the Jews had gone to Babylon, that they learned that demons were evil spirits, or regarded them as such. But having learned

the heathen notions about *demons*, and forsaking their own scriptures, they gradually made void God's law by these and their own traditions ; so that demons, and the possession of demons, were as familiar to them in Christ's day, as among the heathen around them. It is a great mistake in some, who think, the possession of demons was unknown before and after the days of Jesus Christ and his apostles. In Christ's day, the possession of demons was no new thing, as has been repeatedly proved from heathen writers, as may appear in the sequel. Besides, the persons supposed to be possessed with demons, labored under the very same or similar disorders as those mentioned in the New Testament. All diseases, either of body or mind, were not imputed to demons. Christ cured Peter's wife's mother of a fever and the person born blind, but these evils are not ascribed to the possession of demons. Epileptics, lunatics, and madmen in Christ's day, and long before it, were said to be possessed with demons ; and wherever ignorance and superstition have prevailed, strange and unaccountable things are generally ascribed to supernatural beings as the cause of them. A great many people are fond of the marvellous ; and it could be shown, that among the ancient Jews, things were ascribed to God, which were done by men. The heathen ascribed all good things to their good gods, but evil things to evil spirits. But Job ascribed both to the true God. See Job ii. 10.

Evil spirits. This phrase is used in the New Testament, and is synonymous to the word *demons*. And as the Old Testament is allowed to be the best commentary on the New, the phraseology, idioms, and modes of thought and speech, being borrowed from it, some light will be shed on the subject before us. We

begin by noticing the usage of the term *spirit*. Its peculiar usage may be seen at length by consulting a concordance on this word. For example, we read of "the spirit of prophecy, the spirit of slumber," etc. Dr. Campbell observes — "that it is a common idiom among the Jews to put *spirit* before any quality ascribed to a person, whether good or bad, mental or corporal thus, the spirit of fear is used to express habitual fear," etc. It is easily perceived from this, that any bad thing might be turned into an *evil spirit* by connecting the word *spirit* with it. And this was the more easily done, if the term *spirit* was applied to imaginary beings, supposed to do men evil. They were personified, and spoken of as real beings, and were believed by many to have an actual existence, and could do them good or evil. Hence they offered sacrifices to them, to procure their favor or turn away their displeasure; for what is it, which ignorance and superstition will not lead men to do in religion? But let us see what is said about,

"*Evil spirits*" *in the Old Testament?* This phrase in the plural, is not found there, but the expression "evil spirit in the singular occurs in the following places. In Judges ix. 23 it is said — then God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem; and the men of Shechem dealt treacherously with Abimelech." But I ask, did God send a fallen angel between Abimelech and the men of Shechem? No one I think affirms this, for "*evil spirit*" here does not mean a *demon*, a *wicked being*, but *a spirit of opposition and hostility*, as the context shows. In all the other places, where the phrase "*evil spirit*" occurs, it refers to Saul. Thus it is said, 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 15, 16 — "but the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the

Lord troubled him. And Saul's servants said unto him, behold now, an evil spirit from God troubleth thee. Let our Lord now command thy servants, which are before thee, to seek out a man who is a cunning player on an harp: and it shall come to pass, when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand, and thou shalt be well." In verses 17—23 we are told that David was sent for, and it is added verse 23 — "And it came to pass when the *evil spirit from God* was upon Saul, that David took an harp, and played with his hand: so Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." But from chap. xviii. 10, and xix. 9, we learn that this *evil spirit* returned upon Saul, and under its influence he attempted to kill David. But can any one suppose, God sent a fallen angel or wicked being on Saul, or, that he was a *demoniac.* What then was this evil spirit? The Chaldee paraphrast says — "Saul was mad, or acted as a madman in his house." Saul's disorder at first, seems to have been only a melancholy madness, and it is likely the women's praises of David made him worse. — "Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands," roused him to jealousy and fury, and led him to attempt killing David. See 1 Sam. xviii. 7—12, and xix. 9—12. Saul's wrath seems to have been directed only against David. Had his "*evil spirit*" been a fallen angel or a wicked being, how could his servants suppose, David's music could drive him away? and did so for a season. Are such beings charmed, or frightened away by fine music? But if his disease was melancholy, it is well known, that to this day good music tends to remove it. It is said by Theophrastus — "music cures many disorders of the mind and body — such as faintings, fears, and

disorders of the mind. The playing upon the pipe cures the sciatica and epilepsy." And Martianus Capella says, "I have cured madness by symphony." Melancholy might be driven away for a season at least by good music, but how a fallen angel, a wicked spirit could be removed by it, is not easily understood. Maimonides observes — "that the Jews call every sort of melancholy an *evil spirit:* and explains *evil spirit* by disease," which agrees with the usage of *spirit,* as shown above. It is said, that Saul prophesied under his melancholy or madness. And some of the ancients supposed madmen could foretell future events. When the poets spoke of the heathen prophets they represented them as mad, alienated in their minds. Virgil represents the sibyl as foaming and raging. And Lucian represents the Priestess as filled with fury, her hair standing on end, and she burning and foaming, and panting whilst delivering her oracle. Some, even looked on the prophets of the Lord as mad, and sometimes used music to excite prophetic influence. See 2 Kings ix. 11, 12: Jer. xxix. 26. The above are all the texts where an *evil spirit* is mentioned in the Old Testament, and it is obvious, *a fallen angel,* or real being is not meant. But it is also evident, that *madness* in Saul is called an *evil spirit* and *an evil spirit from the Lord.* It is not said, that, he was possessed with it, that it was *in him,* but it is expressly said to have been *upon him* and to have *troubled him,* which we should think was about the same thing.

The case of Saul, illustrates what is to be understood by *demons,* and the possession of them in the New Testament. There, *a demon* and *an evil spirit* evidently mean the same thing, for in the same passages the one expression is used in common for the

other. Again, Saul's *evil spirit* was evidently *insanity;* and in the New Testament, *insane* persons were said to be possessed with a *demon*, or *evil spirit.* Not all whom our Lord cured, were said to be possessed with a *demon*, but only such as were more or less deranged in their minds. This fact, we think is certain, and deserves attention from all, who would correctly understand what is said in the New Testament about *demons*, or, *evil spirits.* It is also a fact, which is too much overlooked, that according to the person's degree of insanity, he was supposed to be possessed with the more demons or evil spirits. Hence we read of persons possessed with "*a demon.*" But Mary Magdalene had seven *demons* in her, and one man declared he had a legion of them within him. But we shall see in the sequel, that he was a wild, raving maniac. But again, it is said, that Saul's "evil spirit was from the Lord," yet nothing like this is said of persons who were possessed with demons in the days of our Lord. But this difference is easily and rationally accounted for, by a fact which I shall soon notice. The ancient Jews ascribed to God both the good and evil things which happened to them, as could easily be shown, and noticed already in the case of Job. But we shall see, that after the Babylonish captivity, the Jews ascribed great and unaccountable evils, such as madness, to the influence of evil spirits. Before this period, they knew nothing about such *spirits*, for their scriptures teach no such beings.

"*Unclean spirit.* This phrase, is only used once in the Old Testament, in Zach. xiii. 2. "And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of hosts, that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered; and also I will cause the prophets and the *unclean spirit*

to pass out of the land." If the day here mentioned, refers to the gospel day, as some think it does, it predicts, that then, *idols* and the *demons* they represented, were to be done away. *Unclean spirit*, and in the plural *unclean spirits*, are mentioned in the New Testament, Math. xii. 43: Luke xi. 24: Mark i. 23, 26: iii. 30: v. 2, 8: Luke viii. 29: Mark vii. 25: Luke ix. 42: Math. x. 1: Mark vi. 7: i. 27: Luke iv. 36: Mark iii. 11: v. 13: Acts v. 16: viii. 7: Rev. xvi. 13. The phrase "*foul spirit*," occurs Mark ix. 25: Rev. xviii. 2. But in the Greek it is the same "unclean spirit," as in the above passages. The phrase, in the New Testament, was probably taken from this passage in the Old, and few will assert, that it means there a fallen angel or wicked being. But what deserves special notice is, 1. that since the light of the gospel dispensation dawned on the world, *demons*, *evil spirits*, *unclean spirits*, *idolatry*, and other heathen superstitions, have begun to wax old and to vanish away. This light when universally received into men's minds, will banish such things from the earth. We have referred to all the above texts where the phrase "*unclean spirits*" is to be found in the Bible. Let the reader consult them, and observe, what can hardly escape his observation, that *demons* are often called *spirits* in the New Testament. For example see Math. viii. 16. 2. Demons and "evil spirits" were considered the same, are used as synonymous expressions; for to cast out a demon, was the same as to cast out an "evil spirit," and the supposed power of the one was the same as that of the other. 3. A demon, and an "unclean spirit" are also represented as the same, convertible expressions denoting the same thing. No one can doubt this, who has read the New Testament, particularly

the four gospels. For example in Luke iv. 33, we are told of a man, who "had a spirit of an unclean demon." 4. From comparing the passages relating to demons, "unclean spirits," and Beelzebub, all relate to the same thing, as could be shown. It has been alleged, that Beelzebub is the same as *diabolos*, *the devil* or *Satan*. But the popular belief then was, that, "he was the prince of the demons," and is the representation given in the New Testament concerning him, as we shall see afterwards.

Familiar spirits. The phrases, "familiar spirit," and "familiar spirits," occurs in the following places in the Old Testament, which the reader can consult at his leisure. Levit. xx. 27, 28. 1 Chron. x. 13. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. Isai. xxix. 4. Levit. xix. 31, xx. 6. Deut. xviii. 11. 1 Sam. xxviii. 3, 9. 2 Kings xxi. 6, xxiii. 24. Isai. viii. 19. xix. 3. But he ought to observe, *that neither of these phrases is used in the New Testament.* One or two remarks are sufficient on all the above passages. I shall merely name the following things which deserve the readers notice in the above passages. 1. Persons who pretended to have "*a familiar spirit*" were to be banished from among the Jews. 2. Persons who consulted with familiar spirits among the Jews were to be put to death. Saul and Manasseh did so, but their station in life saved them from death. 3. The persons who had a familiar spirit, pretended to consult with and bring up the dead. Saul consulted with the woman at Endor, that she might bring up Samuel to consult him in his distress. 4. Persons who had a familiar spirit were ventriloquists, and imposed on people, making their voice to sound as if it arose out of the ground, as we have shewn in a former publication, and has been shewn by others.

2. *The apocryphal books.* In these books *demons* and *evil spirits* are mentioned, and require a brief notice. In Baruch iv. 7, it is said—"for ye provoked him that made you by sacrificing unto devils (*daimoniois*) and not to God." This text is in accordance with those already noticed in the Old Testament. The Jews often sacrificed to *demons*, or *heathen gods*, but never to *diabolos* the devil, or *to devils*. I may just notice here, that the phrases "unclean spirits" and "familiar spirits" are not once mentioned in the apocryphal books. They were written after the captivity in Babylon, and on the return of the Jews from it, they were less given to idolatrous practices than before it, which may account for this.

All the other places, where *demons*, or *evil spirits*, are mentioned in the apocryphal books, are, Tobit, Chapters iii. 8 : vi. 17, and viii. 2, which the reader may consult. But every child has read the story concerning Asmodeus *the evil spirit*, and how the smell of the heart and liver of a fish drove him to the uttermost parts of Egypt. The story is too absurd and childish to deserve serious notice. It deserves notice however, that the apocryphal writers seem to have believed in *demons* or *evil spirits*, which the inspired writers in the canonical books did not. This fact is of importance on the subject of *demons*, for it shews when, and how the Jews imbibed such opinions, as the following quotations admit.

Dr. Knapp in his theology, vol. 1. p. 448, thus writes—"There is no trace of a belief in the existence of evil spirits even among the Jews, until the Babylonian captivity." Again, in p. 425, he says—"it is not until the time of the exile, or shortly after it, that we find distinct traces of the doctrine, that there are angels who were once good, but who revolt-

ed from God, and are now become wicked themselves, and the authors of the evil in the world. The probability is therefore, that this doctrine was first developed among the Jews during their residence in Chaldea and shortly afterwards." I might quote more to the same purpose, but I shall only add from pp. 465, 466. "The extravagant opinions which formerly prevailed on this subject were the means of much injury, as appears from experience. They led the common people to what was, in effect, a belief in two gods—a good and an evil deity ; and also to entertain false conceptions of the attributes of the true God, which could not have been without a practical influence on the life. They often furnish a real hindrance to moral improvement ; for instance ; in seeking for the origin of sin in themselves, and endeavoring to stop its sources —instead of becoming acquainted with, and avoiding the external occasions of sin, they laid the whole blame of it upon Satan, and when they had made him guilty, deemed themselves sufficiently justified and exculpated." Such are the remarks of an orthodox German divine, whose work was translated at Andover, and highly approved by the Professors there. I never expected to see the day, when my views should receive such confirmation from such a source. The reader ought to notice, that Dr. Knapp does not pretend, the Jews had the doctrine of *evil spirits* revealed to them by God, at, or during the Babylonian captivity. An important question then arises—how came they to learn this doctrine ? This question we have answered in the first part of this work and in the first Inquiry, etc. It has been shewn from Dr. Campbell and other writers, that the Jews brought back from their captivity many opinions not found in their sacred books. Their minds were corrupted from their inter-

course with the heathen, and when both Jews and heathen were converted to the faith of Christ, many false heathen notions were introduced into the Christian Church, which are not all yet purged out. The *devil*, and other spirits, are of this number, as Dr. Knapp admits. In the above investigation, the statements I have quoted from him, are strongly confirmed, for no one could find the doctrine of evil spirits in the Old Testament, unless he took it there with him. But on the contrary must see, that *demons*, *evil spirits*, *familiar spirits*, etc. all stand condemned there, and severe punishments were inflicted on the Jews who turned aside to such heathen worship and superstitions. Whatever they knew about *demons*, *evil spirits*, etc., was not learned from their own scriptures, but from the heathen around them. Many of their laws, were given to maintain a separation of them from the Gentile nations. But after all those laws, and the punishments endured for the breach of them, they broke over this partition wall and learned the ways of their heathen neighbors. Much light would be shed on the subject of demons, and the possession of demons in the New Testament, if we had a full and perfect account of the heathen views on this subject. But imperfect as this is we shall not be able to use all the materials we have found suited to our purpose. We shall content ourselves with a few brief statements.

Enfield in his Philosophy says, pp. 33—36. "It appears, not only from the testimony af Diodorus, but from other ancient authorities collected by Eusebius that the Chaldeans believed in God, the Lord and Parent of all, by whose providence the world is governed. And indeed without this it is impossible to conceive, how their religious rites should ever have

arisen : for the immediate object of these rites was a supposed race of spiritual beings or *demons*, whose existence could not have been imagined, without first conceiving the idea of a supreme being the source of all intelligence. Besides the supreme being, the Chaldeans supposed spiritual beings to exist, of several orders, gods, demons, heroes. These they probably divided into subordinate classes, as their practice of theology, or magic required. The ancient eastern nations in general, and among the rest the Chaldeans, admitted the existence of certain evil spirits, clothed in habiliments of gross matter, and in subduing or counteracting these, they placed a great part of the efficacy of their religious incantations. The magic which the Chaldean Zoroaster invented, was probably nothing more than the performance of certain religious ceremonies, by means of which good demons were supposed to be prevailed upon to communicate supernatural properties to herbs, stones, and other natural bodies, or to afford assistance, in other miraculous ways, to those who invoked them. In war, it was supposed that by the help of magic the forces of an enemy might be routed, or an army struck with a general panic, as is said to have happened to Ninus in his war with the Bactrians. Notwithstanding the obscurity with which antiquity has covered the Chaldean philosophy, it has been highly extolled, not only by the Orientalists and Greeks, but by Jewish and Christian writers." Let it be remembered, that the Jews spent seventy years in Babylon, and brought back from their captivity there, many of the heathen opinions of the people as is universally admitted. Concerning the Celts, Enfield says p. 94—" that they imagined the magnificent and gloomy scenes of nature to be inhabited by demons, fully appears from the

Edda. Nor can any other reason be assigned for the superstitious notion which prevailed among them, than that these scenes were frequently the seat of oracular communications." On p. 81 he says—"the doctrine of an etherial intelligence pervading and animating the material world, appears, among the Egyptians, to have been from the earliest time accompanied with a belief in inferior divinities. Conceiving emanations from the divinity to be resident in various parts of nature, when they saw life, motion, and enjoyment communicated to the inhabitants of the earth from the sun, and, as they supposed, from other heavenly bodies, they ascribed these effects to the influence of certain divinities, derived from the first deity, which they supposed to inhabit these bodies. Hence arose their worship of the sun, under the name of Osiris, Amon, and Horus, etc. From the same source it may be easily conceived, that, among the Egyptians as well as in other nations, would arise the worship of deified men, such as illustrious heroes, legislators, or improvers of human life by useful inventions and institutions. Hence they concluded that a large portion of that divinity, which animates all things resided in them, and supposed that after death, the good *demon* that animated them passed into the society of the divinities.

Enfield informs us, p. 256, that Xenocrates taught —"the heavens are divine, and the stars celestial gods; and that besides these divinities, there are terrestrial *demons*, of a middle order between the gods and men, which partake of the nature both of mind and body, and are therefore, like human beings, capable of passions, and liable to diversity of character. Like Plato he probably thought, the inferior gods or demons, to be derived from the soul of the world, and like that principle, to be compounded of a simple and

divisable substance." On page 356, he says—"*demons* were divided into superior and inferior ; the superior, those which inhabited the sun and stars, which they considered as animated substances ; the inferior, human souls separated from the body, or heroes, illustrious men says Cicero, whose souls survive and enjoy immortality are justly esteemed to be gods, since they are of an excellent and immortal nature. And, p. 420, we are told—"subordinate to the deity, it was taught in the Italic school, that there are three orders of intelligences, gods, demons, heroes, who are distinguished by their respective degrees of excellence and dignity, and by the nature of the homage which is due to them ; gods being to be preferred in honour of demi-gods or demons, and demons to heroes, or men. These three orders, in the Pythagorean system, were emanations at different degrees of proximity from the supreme intelligence, the particles of subtle ether assuming a grosser clothing the farther they receded from the fountain. The third order, or heroes, were supposed to be invested with a subtle material clothing. If to these three species we add a fourth, the human mind, we have the whole scale of divine emanation, as it was conceived by this sect of Philosophers." Other heathen Philosophers might be quoted who held similar opinions, and will be referred to in the course of our investigation. It is evident from these statements that the heathen had abundance of *demons* and various kinds of them.

In the preceding remarks, we have said but little, as to the meaning given the words *daimon* and *daimonion*, but shall now introduce what orthodox Lexicographers and others say concerning them.

"1. *Daimon.*" Parkhurst says, it means, "1. A demon, an intelligence. Its senses in the heathen

writers may be seen under *daimonion* first and second, besides which it sometimes signifies fortune, sometimes an attendant genius." He says "2. In the New Testament it is used only for an evil spirit, a fallen angel." But so far from producing proof of this, he adds to the contrary—"the seventy's version of Isai. xiii. 21, where the Hebrew *shorim*, rough; hairy creatures, is rendered by *daimonia demons*, agreeably to the heathen notions, that their *demons*, such as *Pan, the Fawns, Satyrs*, etc. appeared in the shape of rough, shaggy animals." Parkhurst, here comfirms, what was said above on some texts in the Old Testament. He says "Rev. xviii. 2, seems an illusion to the seventy's version of Isai. xiii. 21" and shews the New Testament writers used *daimon* in the Old Testament sense of *daimonia*, which in no instance refers to fallen angels. It would be strange indeed, if the New Testament writers differed so much from the Old, as to make *demons* fallen angels, yet give us no account of so great an alteration, for we have seen the Jews knew nothing about evil spirits until the Babylonian captivity. When, pray, were *demons* converted into evil spirits? But let us hear him on,

"2. *Daimonion*." Parkhurst says, it signifies "1. A deity, a god, or more accurately some power or supposed intelligence in that grand object of heathen idolatry, the material heavens or air. Thus the word is generally applied by the seventy who use it, Isai. lxxv. 11, for *god*, the destructive troop, or powers of the heavens, in thunder, lightning, storm, etc. In Deut. xxxii. 17; Psal. cv. 35, for *sedim*, the pourers forth, or genial powers of nature; and as by *daimoniou mesemnou*, the mid-day demon, Psal. xci. 6, we may be certain they intended not a devil, but a pernicious blast of air. (Comp. Isai. xxviii. 2, in the He-

brew,) so from this and the fore-cited passages, we can be at no loss to know what they meant, when in their translation of Psal. xcvi. 5, they say—All the gods of the Gentiles are *daimonia*, i. e. not *devils* but some powers or imaginary intelligences of material nature. But it must be observed, that according to the highly probable opinion of that learned Jew, Maimonides, the error of the first idolaters consisted in their maintaining, that, as the *stars* and *planets*, to which I think we should add the circulating fluid of the heavens, were created by God to govern the world, so it was his pleasure, that they should be honored and worshipped as his ministers, and that accordingly men proceeded to adore them, in order to procure the good will of Him who created them, thus making them mediators between men and God, and this, says he, was the foundation of idolatry, which assertion is amply confirmed by the plain traces of this doctrine being found among the heathen, even down to the time of Christ and his Apostles, and indeed long after. Most express are the words of Plato—'every demon is a middle being between God and mortal man.' If you ask what he means by a middle being, he will tell you—'God is not approached immediately by man, but all the commerce and intercourse between gods and men, is performed *by the mediation of demons*.' Would you see the particulars? '*Demons* are reporters and carriers from men to the gods, and again from the gods to men, of the supplications and prayers of the one, and of the injunctions and rewards of devotion from the other.' The Philosopher Plutarch, who flourished at the beginning, and of Apuleius, who lived after the middle of tho second century, teach the same doctrine. And this says the learned Mede was the ecumenical phi-

losophy of the Apostles' times, and of the times long before them. Thales and Pythagoras, all the academics and Stoics, and not many to be excepted, unless the Epicures, taught this divinity. Now, when Paul affirms, 1 Cor. x. 20, that what the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice *daimoniois*, not to God, we may understand *daimonia* to mean either some powers or supposed intelligences of material nature in general, or, in a more confined sense, according to the common opinion of the Gentiles in his time, such powers or intelligences considered as mediators between the supreme God and mortal men. 'For this' says Mr. Mede 'was then the very tenet of the Gentiles, that the sovereign and celestial gods were to be worshipped only with the pure mind, and with hymns and praises; and that sacrifices were only for *demons*.' I will not, however, take upon me positively to affirm, that Paul had in view this latter tenet of heathenism in the above passage. It is sufficient to prove his assertion, that the general objects to which the Gentile sacrifices were offered, were nothing higher than some powers of material nature, or some intelligences supposed to reside therein; than this, nothing can be more certain, from all accounts sacred and profane. And thus *daimonion* is used 1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

2. Besides these original *daimonia*, those material mediators, or the intelligences residing in them, whom Apuleius calls a higher kind of demons, who were always free from the incumbrances of the body, and out of which higher order Plato supposes guardians were appointed unto men,—besides these, the heathen acknowledged another sort, namely *the souls of men* deified or canonized after death. So Hesiod, one of the most ancient heathen writers, describing that happy race of men who lived in the first and golden

age of the world, saith, that after this generation were dead, they were by the will of great Jupiter promoted to be demons, keepers of mortal men, observers of their good and evil works, clothed in air, always walking about the earth, givers of riches ; and this, saith he, is the royal honour that they enjoy.' Plato concurs with Hesiod, and asserts that 'he and many other poets speak excellently, who affirm, that when good men die, they attain great honour and dignity, and become demons.' The same Plato in another place maintains, that 'all those who die valiantly in war are of Hesiods golden generation, and are made *demons*, and that we ought forever after to serve and adore their sepulchres as the sepulchres of *demons*. The same also, says he, we decree whenever any of those who were excellently good in life, die either of old age, or in any other manner.' And according to this notion of *daimonion*, the word appears to be applied in several passages of the New Testament. Thus Acts xvii. 18, some of the Athenians said of Paul, he seemeth to be a proclaimer of strange demons—gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. In the similar sense of demon-gods, or souls of dead men deified or canonized, the word is used Rev. ix. 20, and in the expression doctrines concerning demons 1 Tim. iv. 1, as doctrine concerning baptisms, Heb. vi. 2 ; the doctrine concerning the Lord, Acts xiii. 12. For proof I refer to Mr. Mede and Bishop Newton, and to what they have adduced on this subject shall only add, that Ignatius, who, according to Crysostom, had conversed familiarly with the Apostles, plainly uses *daimonion* for a human spirit or ghost, and the adjective *daimonikos for one disembodied*, and in the state of spirits." But Parkhurst says, *daimonion* means "3, and most generally, an

evil spirit, a devil, one of those angels who kept not their first estate, and are called by the collective name satan, and *diabolos* the devil." But all the proof he gives of this is, a reference to some texts without note or comment upon them, and to the book of Tobit. Here he spoke from his prejudice in favour of the popular opinions ; for not in a single instance is *diabolos* called a *demon* in the Bible, or a *demon diabolos;* nor are the two names confounded, as if they meant the same thing. And where is it intimated that a *demon* was a fallen angel? What he has said above, is at variance with such a sentiment. Had he found a single text, from which he could have proved, that a *demon* was an *evil spirit, satan, diabolos,* or *the devil,* no doubt that he would have done it. But

3. On the word "*daimonizomai*" he says, it means – "to be possessed by a *demon.* It is the same as— *daimon chein to have a demon,* or *devil,* John vii. 20. Those who were possessed with prophesying demons, Acts xvi. 16 were called by the Greeks *daimenoleptoi.* See Archbishop Potter's Antiquities of Greece. In the New Testament the word *daimoniodes* occurs only once, viz. in James iii. 15, and is rendered in our common version *devilish.* Parkhurst makes no remarks on it, nor does it require any particular notice.

Such is Parkhurst's account of *demons ;* and it is obvious, how much it agrees with what is said in the Old Testament about *demons.* How he reconciled this account with his bare statement, that *demons* were fallen angels I know not, for he does not attempt it, and I feel assured that it never can be done. The passages he refers to in the New Testament are, Math. viii. 31 ; Mark v. 12; Luke viii. 29 ; Rev. xvi. 14, and the reader can consult them. They will be considered in the sequel. In passing we shall only say,

such texts can never prove *demons* to be *fallen angels* in opposition to all he has said to the contrary, and what he has said, is for substance what others have said before him.

We come now, to an examination of the New Testament respecting *demons* and of persons being possessed with them. But we ought to come to it, in full view of the light given us on the subject from the Old Testament, the apocryphal books, and other writers we have quoted above. Nor, should the indisputable fact be forgotten, which is stated by Dr. Knapp, that evil spirits were not known among the Jews until the Babylonian captivity. It is certain, as we have seen, that the Jews knew about *demons* long before this period, for they sacrificed their sons and daughters to them. Who then converted them into evil spirits, and instructed them, that they could possess men's bodies and inflict disorders upon them? How, and by whom was this great change in demons effected? No change was effected in them; the change was in the Jews, in adopting the popular opinions which then prevailed about demons. And I shall show this from facts which we think cannot be disputed.

1. It is a fact that demons are never spoken of as evil spirits in the New Testament, except in connexion with disorders which popular heathen notions had ascribed to them. All diseases were not imputed to demons or evil spirits as is obvious from the four gospels, but such as were strange, difficult to account for, incurable or very difficult to cure; such as madness, epilepsy, etc. This we shall see afterwards, and is a fact which we think few will dispute.

2. It is also a fact, that the New Testament writers, never intimate, that *demons* in their day, were to

be understood differently from what they were in the days of Moses and the prophets—that anciently they were heathen gods, imaginary beings, but now had become evil spirits to inflict disorders on men. They indeed speak of persons under certain disorders as being possessed with demons, but aside from such cases, they never assert *demons* to be real beings of any kind, that could injure any person either in body or mind. On the contrary it is

3, An indisputable fact that when they speak of *demons* aside from diseased persons they speak of them as the writers of the Old Testament did before them. As these facts are of importance, in examining the New Testament respecting demons, I shall first introduce the texts in it which prove the last fact, and do it in a very satisfactory manner. When this is done, much is accomplished, showing that *demons* in the New Testament were not evil spirits or fallen angels any more than in the Old. The passages I quote are the following.

1 Cor. x. 20, 21. "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *demons*, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with *demons*. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of *demons*: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of *demons*." The Gentiles did not sacrifice either to the true God or *diabolos the devil*. Macknight says—"they sacrificed to *demons*. The word *daimonia, demons*, is used in the seventy to denote the ghosts of men deceased; and Josephus, Bell. lib. 7. c. 6 says *demons* are the spirits of wicked men. It is therefore probable, that the writers of the New Testament used the word *demon* in the same sense, especially as it is well known, that the greatest part of the heathen gods

were dead men. The heathen worshipped two kinds of demons, the one kind were the souls of kings and heroes deified after death, but who could have no agency in human affairs. The other kind of *demons*, were those evil spirits, who under the names of Jupiter, Apollo, Trophonius, etc. moving the heathen priests and priestesses to deliver oracles, greatly promoted idolatry. The heathen in general, had no idea of God ; that is, of an unoriginated, eternal, immutable, and infinitely perfect being, the creator and governor of all things. In the heathen sacrifices, the priests, before they poured the wine upon the victim, tasted it themselves ; then carried it to the offerers, and to those who came with them, that they also, might taste it, as joining in the sacrifice, and receiving benefits from it—*of the table* of demons ; that is, of the sacrifice offered to demons, which was eaten on a table in the demons temple." I add from Dr. Campbell, who says—" Now in regard to idols, the Apostle had said in the same epistle, 1 Cor. viii. 4, that an idol is nothing in the world ; in other words, is the representation of an imaginary being. It is as much as to say, Jupiter, and Juno, and Saturn, and all the rest of the heathen gods, as delineated by the poets and mythologists, are *nonentities*, the mere creatures of imagination." He adds, " besides, a great part of the heathen worship was confessedly paid to the ghosts of departed heroes, of conquerors, and potentates, and of the inventors of arts, whom popular superstition, after disguising their history with fables and absurdities blindly deified. Now, to all such beings, they themselves, as well as the Jews assigned the name *demonia*." I ask, can any thing be more clear and conclusive than this, that *demons* in Paul's day were the same as those mentioned in the Old

Testament ? But if any one should assert that they are different we call for the proof of it.

Acts xvii. 18. "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods : because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." This, I believe, is the only place in the New Testament where *daimonia* is rendered *gods*. The Athenians, seem to have supposed, that Paul preached *Jesus* as one *god*, and the resurrection as another, and deemed them as new and strange gods at Athens, as the heathen gods were to the Jews mentioned in the Old Testament, and noticed already. Had the translators of our English version, rendered here as they have done in other places, they would have made the Athenians say, Paul was a "setter forth of strange devils." I wish they had done so, for it would have led people to reflect, if the term devils was a correct rendering in other passages where *daimonia* occurs. The word *daimonia* in this text, is used in a good sense, being applied to the souls of men deified or canonized after death at Athens. This remark applies also to other texts which could be shown were it necessary. But whether the Athenians, deemed their *gods* or *demons* good or bad, Paul did not admit them to be beings of any kind whatever. On the contrary his "spirit was stirred within him when he saw their city wholly given to idolatry." The next three texts I shall quote at once as they are very similar, and like the preceding shew the demons of the New Testament to be the same as in the Old.

Rev. ix. 20. "And the rest of the men which were not killed by those plagues yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship *demons* and idols of gold," etc. Rev. xvi. 14. "For they are the spirits of *demons*, working miracles," etc.

And xviii. 2. "Babylon the great is fallen, and is become the habitation of *demons*" etc. Neither heathens, nor Christians worshipped *diaboloi* devils, that I can find. And who can believe, that *demons* the imaginary gods of the heathen could work miracles? And, did Babylon become, "the habitation" of either devils or demons? But all must perceive the similarity of the statements in these texts to some of the passages in the Old Testament which have been considered above. It seems Babylon has been famous as a habitation of *demons* both in ancient and modern times, and demons also famous for working miracles. What demons were, worshipped by Jews and heathens, we have seen already, so far from being gods, evil spirits, or fallen angels, they were lying vanities and could not save them that trusted in them.

1 Tim. iv. 1. "Giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines concerning demons." This is Macknight's version, and in a note he says—"the word translated *demons* was used by the Greeks, to denote a kind of beings of a middle nature between God and man. See on 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. They gave the name also, to the souls of some departed men, who they thought were exalted to the state and honour of demons for their virtue. See Newton on the prophecies vol. ii. p. 418. The former sort they called superior demons, and supposed them to have the nature and office which we ascribe to angels. The latter they termed inferior demons. They were of the same character with the Romish saints, and both sorts were worshipped as mediators. When therefore the spirit of God foretold in an audible manner, that in after times, many would give heed to deceiving spirits, and to doctrines concerning demons, he foretold, that on the authority of feigned revelation, many

in the Church would receive the doctrine concerning the worship of angels and saints, and praying of souls out of purgatory ; and called it the doctrine of demons, because it was in reality the same with the ancient heathenish worship of demons, as mediators between the gods and men." The souls of men, canonized after death, are modern demons, are mediators between God and men, and like the ancient demons have been supposed to heal men and inflict disorders upon them, as they felt disposed. Christians in modern times, are not free from the worship of demons. Wherein lies the great difference, of paying devotion to the ghost of a dead canonized saint, and an ancient deified hero? And is it not as easy, to pray souls out of purgatory as to reform them in hell? If christians made themselves better acquainted with their Bible, and also with ancient heathen opinions, they would see, that it is the heathen notions which have been blended with Christianity, that have produced the endless divisions among them. They would see, that some of their darling dogmas were derived from the heathen, and are even expressed in heathen phraseology. Demons or evil spirits, is but a small part of what Christians have borrowed from the heathen as I have attempted to show in this work and in other publications.

We have seen elsewhere, that to have a demon and be possessed with a demon means the same thing. Thus, the Jews said of Christ

John x. 20, 21—"he hath a demon and is mad, why hear ye him? others said these are not the words of him that hath a *demon*, can a *demon* open the eyes of the blind?" On this passage the improved version says—"observe, these words express cause and effect, the disease is insanity , the supposed cause is posses-

sion by a demon, or *human ghost*, than which no supposition can be more absurd ; but it was the philosophy of the age." See also John vii. 20. And viii. 40—53, where similar charges are brought against the Saviour which I need not quote. If to have a *demon* and *being mad* express cause and effect, as seems to be true, our Lord's own relations stated the effect without naming the supposed cause, for they said concerning him, he—"is beside himself." They probably said this, from his teachings and actions being so different from that of others, and so contrary to their wishes.

Matt. xi. 18, says concerning John Baptist "for John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say he hath a *demon*." It is repeated, Luke vii. 33, and need not be quoted. Dr. Lightfoot observes—"that it was customary for the Jews to attribute to evil spirits certain great disorders, which either distorted the body or occasioned phrenzy or distraction of the mind." It seems that, John like the Saviour was deemed deranged in his mind ; and his appearance and manner of life perhaps led people to draw this conclusion. His raiment was of camel's hair, he had a girdle of leather about his loins, his meat was locusts and wild honey, and he frequented the wilderness, to which melancholy, or mad people resorted. Josephus says that "*demoniacs* were possessed by the spirits of bad men," and such seems to have been the *demons* the Jews ascribed to John and Jesus. It is said, the demons mentioned in scripture were all understood in a bad sense by the father's of the Church. But to this we think there are some exceptions, as could be shown, if it were necessary. It could also be shown that the charge against John and Jesus, that they had *a demon* was not general, for we are told, "others

said, these are not the words of him that hath a *demon*, can a *demon* open the eyes of the blind?" The common sense of people told them, that the charge was false against the Saviour. But, there was something so unaccountable about both, so different from other persons, that according to the popular opinions of the age, that they imputed it to being possessed with a demon.

But the following statements deserve, particular notice, for they have a direct bearing on the possessions of *demons* mentioned in the New Testament. "The region of the air was supposed by the Pythagoreans to be full of *spirits, demons, or heroes*, who cause sickness or health to man or beast, and communicate at their pleasure, by means of dreams, and other instruments of divination, the knowledge of future events. That Pythagoras himself held this opinion can not be doubted, if it be true, as his biographers relate, that he professed to cure diseases by incantations. It is probable that he derived it from the Egyptians, among whom it was believed that many diseases were caused by demonical possessions." Enfield p. 421. Tertullian says, "*demons*—inflict upon men's bodies diseases; and are the peculiar authors of some sorts of very grievous mischances; but as to the soul, they are the authors of men's going suddenly and extraordinarily beside themselves. The subtility and fineness of their make, enables them to enter into both the body and soul of men." But, how could he know all this? Who ever saw a *demon?* And what Scripture writer describes the "fineness of their make?" Tertullian, and many others have believed demons to be *evil spirits*, but this opinion was derived from the heathen, and not divine revelation, and their notions about them were

mere suppositions. Who told them, demons inflicted diseases on men?

Several disorders, were attributed to the heathen deities as the cause of them, but were mere imaginary beings, or, as Paul declares, were "*nothing in the world.*" And if they had been real beings, as many have *supposed*, who has ever *proved*, or *can prove*, that they produced such disorders? What sacred writer has said they did? The *Epilepsy* was imputed to Apollo, but who can prove that he was the cause of this disorder, or had any power over men? The Romans as well as the Greeks, imputed certain disorders to *demons*, or *evil spirits*. But no one now believes, the disorders of the *Cerviti* or *Larvati* were produced by *Ceres*, the *mother of the gods*, or *spectres*; and that some persons had a legion of *spectres* in them. All this was mere hypothesis, the philosophy of those times, and had no connexion with the diseases imputed to them. We even doubt, if they had a serious belief in their own hypothesis. If they had, why did they prescribe as a cure of disorders produced by *demons*, radish and helebore prepared in a certain way; the water of a smith's forge; the tongue, eyes, gall, and intestines of a dragon; the blood of a mole; diamonds; amber; etc? or, how could they believe, that the drinking the juice of a certain herb called Thalassegle, could cause men to be possessed with demons." See Pliny's Natural History. They must have been strange demons indeed, if such things expelled them. Hippocrates and others among the ancients, have shewn, that epilepsy, melancholy, madness, which were ascribed to demons, are accounted for from natural causes. The man would be deemed mad now, who would impute such disorders to demons, or evil spirits. We indeed speak of

St. Vitus's dance and St. Anthony's fire, but no one belives those saints produced these disorders. Ceres, Apollo, Mars, Neptune, or any demons, had just as little hand in producing the disorders imputed to them.

It is evident, that among the Jews, demons were expelled by natural means. See how Tobit's evil spirit was expelled, as noticed in another place. They were expelled also "by music" and "strong smells," and it is related in Josephus's history, that Solomon found out a root called Baaras, which was put under the seal of the ring, and when held to the nose, drew the demon out at this passage. He relates a story of Eleazor casting out demons in the presence of Vespasian and others; and to convince them of the fact, commanded the demon to overturn a vessel of water as he went out. But the story is too long for quotation, and too absurd to deserve any notice whatever.

I come now, to consider all the passages in the New Testament which speak of *casting out demons*, whether by Christ or others. We begin with the general statements respecting this, and as they are similar, the same remarks apply to them all: the first text is,

Math. iv. 24. "And Jesus' fame went throughout all Syria; and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with *demons*, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them." Comp. Math. ix. 35. Wakefield's note here, deserves the readers notice. He says—"*Demoniacs:* A popular name for one sort of madness, chiefly of the raging kind, founded on a foolish superstition of the vulgar, that madmen were possessed by *the spirits of dead men*, called *demons;* just as others were called *lunatics*, as if affected by the *moon*. So modern times have had their *St. Vitus's* dance, and *St. Anthony's* fire: and these terms are used

without scruple by those, who have not the least notion of the interference of these *saints* in these particular disorders. Indeed, all great irregularities in the system of nature, of which raging madness is one, the ancients both heathen and Jews, but especially the latter, were accustomed to attribute to *supernatural agency*. See my evidences of Christianity, p. 14. 2 Edit. Thus for instance, an unusual and lucky cast of the dice was called by the Romans—'the cast of Venus,' as if occasioned by that goddess. It is wonderful to me, how any man, conversant with classic authors, can entertain any other opinion of the *demoniacs* of the New Testament. Indeed, it is the most remarkable instance I know, of the triumph of prejudice and superstition over learning and good sense. This, however, is not the place to enter more minutely into this question: and I shall only mention, that this idea is nothing new. The same opinion was maintained by several great men both of the last and present century: and among the rest by Joseph Mede, of Christ's College, Cambridge; as learned, and in every view, as respectable a divine, as England ever produced." This quotation confirms many things said above, and applies to several passages which we shall presently consider. It deserves our notice, that in the above passage, the common expression "and he healed them," is applied to all, whatever their disorders were, and intimates, that those supposed to be possessed with demons were diseased as well as the others. But we shall see from other passages, that this mode of speaking is not always observed, and perhaps for this reason, that the bodily diseases of insane persons are not always apparent, hence the demon or madness is said to be cast out, because this was visible to others.

Matt. viii. 16. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with demons; and he cast out *the* spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick." The parallel, or similar passages may be found in Mark i. 32, 34, 39. And Luke iv. 40, 41, which the reader will be pleased to consult. On the whole of them I will merely suggest a few hints. It is very evident, that in these texts demons and spirits express the same thing. It is also evident that those possessed with demons are distinguished from such as were sick with divers diseases. Again, the demons are represented as crying out "thou art Christ the Son of God." But it will be seen from other passages, that it was the *persons* not *the demons* who did this, and it was the persons he rebuked, and suffered them not to speak. According to the popular opinions, the demons were supposed to speak in or through the persons possessed, just as madness now, speaks in or through a maniac. Jesus rebuked a fever, and why not also madness, or any other diseases. See Luke iv. 39. Jesus, Luke xiii. 22, desired them to go and tell Herod, that he cast out demons. But did he mean by this, that he cast out fallen angels? We should think not, but that he cast out madness, cured insane people; a disease which now as then, was often incurable.

In Luke viii. 2, 3, and Mark xvi. 9, we are told Jesus cast seven demons out of Mary Magdalene, and we shall see, that a person declared, that he had a legion of demons within him. I would suggest it for consideration here, whether the number of demons supposed to be in a person, was not determined by the degree of the insanity he manifested. I find no

insane person mentioned in the New Testament, who was not deemed *a demoniac.*

In the following texts, we are told that Jesus gave his disciples power and authority to cast out demons, Matt. x. 8 ; Mark iii. 15 ; Luke ix. 1, and x. 17. Also Mark xvi. 17. But, did he give them power to cast out of persons fallen angels ? or, even the ghosts of dead men deified. If so, then this was done by others besides them, as appears from these texts, which the reader may consult. Mark ix. 38 ; Luke ix. 49 ; Math. vii. 22, 23. Besides, it has been shown, that persons cast out demons, or fallen angels by natural means ; and people are sent to our insane hospitals, and put into the hands of physicians every day, to have fallen angels cast out of them. By what symptoms, or, by what rule was it determined, that demons produced such insanity, and other disorders in ancient times, yet no demons produce such disorders now ? Have hospitals and physicians banished them from the earth ?

We come now to the examination of the passages, which are supposed to teach, that demons are wicked spirits, and were the cause of various disorders among men in the days of our Lord. We request the reader to bear in mind what has been said in the preceding pages. And before we proceed, it may be of use to make the following remarks.

1. Many, yea most of the persons cured by Christ, were not possessed by demons. Those said to be possessed with them, were few in number compared with those whom he healed of various other diseases. Perhaps they bore the same proportion then, that deranged people do now, to all the sick in the community. I do not mention this, as a certain proof that they were deranged people, but if it is proved that

they were, this circumstance goes to confirm it. It is certain, those possessed with demons, were deemed among the diseased he cured, for it is said of them in common with the rest, that—"he healed them," that "they were made whole." Insanity and other great disorders, were not known then as now, to arise from natural causes, hence were ascribed to evil spirits, or, demons. Who now imputes to persons in our insane hospitals, that they are possessed with demons, or, that the wildest maniac has a legion of them in him?

2. As those who were possessed with demons, are distinguished from all other sick and diseased whom our Lord healed, the question arises, in what way were they distinguished from all the others? By what *symptom* did people judge, that any person was possessed with a demon? From malice or prejudice, persons might be accused with having a demon without any just ground for it, as was the case with Jesus and John Baptist. But in the cases about to be introduced, nothing of this kind can be admitted. People must have judged by their bodily senses, when they concluded that a person was possessed of a demon; and certain visible symptoms in the persons appearance, words, and actions, formed the ground of this conclusion. Our bodily senses are not fitted to see spirits at all, much less to see them within a person, and still less to determine, whether he had one, seven, or a legion of demons within him. It is not pretended, any one knew all this by a divine revelation in the Old or New Testament, for we have seen, that demons are spoken of in both as false gods, vanities, or, nothings in the world. No Scripture writer says they are fallen angels, or evil beings of any kind. God is not said to have created them. They are not said to be the ghosts of dead men, either good or bad,

in the Bible, for this is an old heathen superstition. It has waxed old, and like witches has vanished away, but some still suppose they find it in their Bibles.

What then were the external symptoms, which indicated, that persons were possessed with demons? Were they bodily, or mental, or both? In some cases mental, in some both, The bodily symptoms of a fever, or the palsy, etc. were no proofs that a person was possessed with a demon. It was mental aberration in a greater or less degree, or some strange disease, which designated persons to be possessed with demons; and as their derangement was more or less furious, so the number of demons in them was supposed to be. The demon or demons were supposed to enter the persons when they became deranged, and to leave them when restored to a sound mind. It is said by Hammond that "the Jews considered the leprosy as inflicted by God; and the Persians as inflicted by the sun for offending him." And Lightfoot says "the Jews attributed some of the more grievous diseases to evil spirits." And the woman's disorder mentioned Luke xiii. is ascribed to Satan, because she could not stand upright. But in the New Testament, all the persons said to be possessed with demons seem to have been deranged; supposed to be under mental aberration, or some unusual disease of the body. Common bodily diseases are never ascribed to demons. But let us come to the passages, which speak of persons possessed with demons. As they are long, to save room, we request the reader to turn to them and read them.

Math. ix. 32—35; Luke xi. 14—27. Let the reader compare and notice what Matthew says "they brought to Jesus a dumb man possessed with a de-

mon." But Luke seems to say the *demon* was dumb. He "was casting out a demon and *it* was dumb." But was a fallen angel, an evil spirit dumb? No, the man was dumb, for it is said "when the demon was gone out the dumb spake." If the demon was dumb while in the man, it was the man who made him dumb, for as soon as cast out, he became a speaking demon, and our Lord of course cured the demon rather than the man. But this is too absurd to be believed. It is not said, this man was born dumb; his dumbness is imputed to the demon whatever that was. From what has been said in the preceding pages, and will still be said, derangement seems to have been the demon. And this agrees to cases of a similar nature in our own day. Some person's derangement makes them dumb like this person; you cannot make them speak on any subject. They are sullen and silent at all times. But this persons loss of speech, from some unaccountable cause, was sufficient in the language of the times, to have it ascribed to a demon. But when the cause of any disease is inscrutable to Mortals, is it proper to ascribe it to demons, a race of heathen imaginary beings? Why not like Job ascribe it to God?

Math. xii. 22—31. In chap. ix. 32 we have seen, that they brought to Jesus "a dumb man possessed with a *demon*. But in this passage we are informed, there was brought to him — "one possessed with a demon, *blind and dumb*." But surely it was the person, and not the *demon* that was blind and dumb." Farther we are told, that Jesus "*healed him*," not surely the demon but the man. And it is added, "insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw." It is not said Jesus cast the demon out of this man but that "he healed him," and shows us that the *demon*

was the *disease*, which caused his dumbness and want of sight. It is not said of this person, as of one John 9th, that he was born blind. This person's blindness and dumbness seem to have been produced by disease, and we have seen above, that the Jews imputed great disorders both of body and mind to demons. The Pharisees on this occasion, as on several others, said — "This fellow doth not cast out demons, but by Beelzebub, the prince of demons." This shows, that even they deemed *healing* the persons of such a disorder, was the same as casting out the demon. Concerning *Beelzebub*, and our Lord's reasoning with the Pharisees on their charge against him, we shall here notice once for all. It applies to other passages. We are told. that on this occasion, the Pharisees said — "he casteth out demons through the prince of the demons." Beelzebub is repeatedly called the prince of the *demons*, but never the prince of the *devils*, and is one instance out of many where our English word *devils* leads people wrong, being the rendering of both *diabolos* and *daimonion* in our English version of the New Testament. But it is evident from 2 Kings i. 2, that Beelzebub was the god of Ekron, *the fly hunting god* as some affirm, because he preserved his worshippers from these insects, so annoying in hot climates, and was worshipped under the form of a fly." It is said the Jews called every demon *Satan* and *Samael, the prince of Satans*. See Doddridge on Math. xii. But Satan, as we have seen in the first part of this work, simply means an *adversary*. By consulting the passage, it is seen our Lord goes on to reason with the Pharisees, showing them the inconsistency of supposing, that one demon would cast out another, or, that the prince of the *demons* would cast out his own subjects.

And in other passages, shows its inconsistency by a house and kingdom being divided against themselves, that they could not stand.

Math. xvii 14—22; Mark ix. 14—30; Luke ix. 37—43. The case stated in these passages was that of an only child, and had been under the disorder from a child. Celsus and Hippocrates say it was *epilepsy*, and the latter says—"when the disorder is of long standing, it is incurable." The symptoms described in the passages agree to this. Matthew says he was *lunatic*, and this disorder often disorders the mind, as is well known. And his epileptic fits described, are the same as those in the present day, under the same disease. It is evident, a *demon, a spirit* and *a deaf and dumb spirit* mentioned, all designate the same thing, and the effects produced are ascribed to it. But what need was there for an *evil spirit* to produce them, any more than in the present day? The disease was sufficient then as now to produce the effects. The disease was the *demon*, the *dumb*, *deaf*, and *foul spirit*, and nothing else was needed. It produced lunacy of mind, and distress to the body then as now, and rationally accounts for all the distressing effects mentioned. The common usage of the term *spirit* in Scripture, and as used in the case of Saul and others, ought here to be remembered. This case is so plain, that it would be a waste of time to dwell on it. When Jesus cured this child, it is said, he "rebuked" the *demon*, the *unclean spirit* etc. and healed the child. But Jesus is said to have rebuked "a fever" and the winds and waves of the sea, &c. Perhaps the difficulty of curing this disorder, led our Lord to say, prayer and fasting were necessary to cure it. But my limits forbid me noticing this, etc. etc.

Mark i. 23—29; Luke iv. 33—36. By comparing these passages, "an unclean spirit," and "a spirit of an unclean demon," mean the same thing. What was this? It was that which "tore the man, and threw him in the midst." But from these very expressions, brief as they are, it may be concluded, that this man's disorder was similar to the child under the epilepsy already noticed. And that it had deranged his mind we may also infer for he supposed himself possessed of more than one demon, or evil spirit, for he said "let *us* alone; what have we to do with thee thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy *us*? I know thee who thou art, the holy one of God." This man's derangement was not a deaf and dumb spirit, like that of the epileptic child, for he was rather talkative; and it proves nothing against his derangement, that he spoke what he did, for deranged persons often speak truth, and more of it than some wish to hear. When Jesus cured the man, he rebuked him, commanded him to be silent. But had he rebuked the *demon* or *the unclean spirit*, it was only rebuking the man's disease as he did the fever in Peter's wife's mother. When a person is seized with any disease and especially of an extraordinary kind, it is common to inquire what was the cause of it? What produced it? And sometimes we can trace it to its cause, a violent cold or something else. If not, we say, we cannot tell. But in ancient times *unaccountable disorders* were traced to *demons* as the cause of them.

Mark iii. 22—28. The reader will please read this passage and notice, that in verse 21 we are told Jesus' friends "went out to lay hold on him; for they said, he is beside himself. And let him remember, that we have seen, the Jews said of Jesus—"he

hath a demon and is mad." Jesus' friends only mentioned the visible, or supposed visible effect, *derangement* of mind. But the Jews mention both the supposed cause, and the effect. He is "mad," but they also say "he hath a *demon*," which is the cause of it. Now notice what is said verse 22. "And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said — "he hath Beelzebub," naming the very *demon* they supposed him possessed with, and had made him mad. They imputed his madness to no ordinary demon, but to the prince of the demons, and supposed that by this prince of the demons he cast out *demons*. But Beelzebub, as we have noticed above, was the God of Ekron, a heathen deity, which could neither curse nor bless, do good or evil, was a nonentity in the world. But it deserves special notice, that what the Jews said on this occasion, and repeated on several others show what were the popular opinions respecting *demons* in the days of our Lord. Whether true or false, they seem to have been common, pervading all ranks of society as the opinions about witches did among us only a few years ago.

Math. xv. 21—29; Mark vii. 24—31. The case recorded in these two passages, is that of the daughter of a woman, who was a Greek. She said — "My daughter is *grievously vexed with a demon*. Mark calls it "an unclean spirit," and also a *demon*, which shows both these phrases expressed the same thing. The mother's request was, that Jesus "would cast forth the *demon*, the unclean spirit out of her daughter." But how did she know, or suppose, that it was in her? for no disease of body or insanity of mind, is mentioned about her in either of the passages. Yet we are told, she "was made whole from that very hour, and when her mother came to her house, "she

found the *demon* gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed." Now, what *demon* did she find had gone out of her daughter? Certainly the demon which before had "grievously vexed" her. And what demon could this be, but the disease of which Jesus had cured her? What her disease was, we may at least conjecture from other passages, where it is said a demon "vexed or grievously tormented" other persons. See Math. viii. 6. We have seen, that all great disorders, of either body or mind, were ascribed to the influence of demons. But as the disorder of of this woman's daughter is not described, it is vain for us to say, what it precisely was. Perhaps, it was not exactly known to themselves, and its symptoms so different from those of other diseases, that no description is given of it. But from the popular opinions of the day about demons, and her daughter's disease, the mother concluded she was grievously vexed with a demon. And when she came home to her house, and found her disease removed, she concluded that the demon had left her. We should think this a plain case, that the only demon in her was her disease, and nothing but the common popular superstition, had imputed its cause to a demon. And this was done in a singular way, as when we impute a fever to a cold. And do we not often ascribe disorders to supposed causes, just as the heathen supposed demons to be the cause of madness and other disorders? When we hear of a friend, or neighbor who has become deranged, we ask what was the cause of it? Sometimes it is imputed to disease, to loss of property, failure in business, and disappointments, &c. And if it cannot be traced to some cause, we never as in ancient times, impute it to a demon. But why not? Because this is not a popular opinion among us, and

we know, that insanity arises from bodily disease, and can be cured by natural means.

Math. viii. 28—34; Mark v. 1—21; Luke viii. 26—40, These three passages contain three accounts of the Gadarene demoniac. They are deemed the strongest, in proving that demons are fallen angels, or, *evil spirits*. My limits do not permit me to say all I designed on these passages. Mathew says there were two men, but Mark and Luke only mention one. As my design and limits forbid me to discuss this and other things, I shall confine myself to the question, was the person commonly called — the Gadarean demoniac actually possessed with demons? To answer this question correctly, we ought to consider, what was the *real condition* of this man — and what was his *supposed condition*. 1. Let us inquire, what was his *real condition*, when our Lord met with him at Gadara? It is too obvious to need a labored proof, that he was a deranged man, a madman, a raging, furious maniac. All the three accounts agree in this, and only need to be read to be satisfied of the fact. We are told, that after Jesus had cured him, he was found "sitting, clothed, and in his right mind," and shows, he was not in his right mind before. It would be a waste of time, to say more in proof of this, for this man's dwelling-place, his words, and his actions, all confirm it. Our insane asylums, furnish abundant instances of as strange sayings and doings in person there, as appeared in him, which I decline relating for mere amusement.

2. We then inquire, what was the *supposed* condition of this man? No one needed to *suppose* him a madman for this was notorious to all. The question is, what was *supposed* to be the cause of his madness? Not disease, but to demons which possessed him.

And they are denominated in the accounts "unclean spirits," &c. This was the common popular belief, as we have seen, that all deranged persons were *supposed* to be possessed with demons or evil spirits. The Jews *supposed* our Lord to be possessed with the prince of demons. But a *fact* and a *supposition* are very different things. No evidence of the fact, have we yet seen. The man himself, supposed that he was possessed with demons, yea had a legion of them in him. But what else could this be but supposition, and a very wild supposition of a maniac, founded on the superstitious opinions which prevailed about demons. The *real* condition of the man, accounts rationally for such an extravagant supposition. No man in his sober senses, can believe he had a legion of demons or evil spirits in him. Mary Magdalene had seven demons in her, but as this man was more deranged than she was, it was supposed he had a legion in him. The number of demons were probably increased, according to the degree of the person's insanity, or, the unaccountable nature of the person's disease.

If it is objected, madman as this man was, did he not cry out — "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not." I answer, we all know madmen sometimes speak very rationally and speak the truth, as is well known. Matthew speaks of this *torment* "before the time." But it is not said to be in a future state, and if it was, what then? It was the common belief then as it is now, that the devil and his angels were to torment men for ever. All this was in perfect keeping with the opinions of the day, certainly nothing strange in a madman, for many are mad enough now to hold the same

opinions. Confessing Jesus to be the son of God is no difficulty, unless it could be shown, the man had never heard any thing about Jesus, but was taught to make this confession by the legion of demons he supposed to be in him. But who can prove this? Jesus' fame accounts for the man's confession. I may add, as a reason why the man asked Jesus not to torment him, it is immediately added, both by Mark and Luke, "for he said unto him, come out of the man, thou unclean spirit." The madman seems to have thought, the removal of the demons would prove a torment, and he wished to continue in his present condition.

But what farther shows the *supposed* condition of the man is, what follows. Jesus asked him his name, and he answers — "My name is Legion, for we are many." But was this any thing, but the man's own wild supposition? And he goes on, and besought Jesus in behalf of the demons, "that he would not send them away out of the country." And was not this mere imagination? We are then told — "There was nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding," said to be about two thousand. And it is then said, "all the demons besought him, saying, "send us into the swine, that we may enter into them." But did a Legion of demons in the man, all make this request? or, did they use the man's organs of speech to make it for them? But be this as it may, Jesus gave them leave, and out they went into the swine, "and the herd ran violently down a steep place and were choked in the sea." The request of the demons was, that they might not be sent out of the country, nor to go out "into the deep," but into the swine, and as soon as they got into them, they rush with the swine out into the deep. But strange as all this appears, it is related as a fact, that the

swine did rush into the sea and perished, as the after part of the accounts show. The important, and only question we need now to consider is — what went out of the man and entered into the swine? One, or other of the following views must be taken, for the case does not admit of a third.

1. That the *demons* went out of the man and entered into the swine. But if we take this view of the matter, it follows, that a whole legion of demons were in the man, went out of him and entered into two thousand swine. How many this was to each of them the reader can calculate. And to take this view of the subject, is at variance with all said in the Bible about *demons*, except in this account and the few passages which speak of persons possessed with them. The Old and New Testament writers speak of *demons* as heathen gods, *nothings* in the world, as we have seen above. But the account we are considering, is in unison with the popular superstition which prevailed in the time of our Lord, as has been shown in the course of our remarks. And who will not allow, that to believe a legion of demons was in this madman, and leaving him entered into two thousand swine, is not very agreeable to reason, common sense, or observation. If a man now, in one of our insane hospitals, spoke and acted just as this madman did, and the superintendant imputed all this to his being possessed with demons, he would be immediately dismissed as unfit for his situation.

2. The only other answer, which can be given to the question is, that the man's *madness* left him, and went into the swine. Nothing else could leave the one and go into the other, for this was all in the man to go out, which could affect the swine. His wild insanity, led him to suppose a legion of demons were

in him, and to request that they might be permitted to enter the swine. And when the man's madness left him and entered the swine, they became mad and rushed on to their own destruction. Nor is it strange that the man's insanity should be transferred to them, any more than that Naaman's leprosy should be transferred to Gehazi, 2 Kings chap. v. To say, the man's madness entered into the swine, is rational, and accounts for their rushing into the sea. If insanity in the man, drove him to act as he did, it need not surprise us, that when it entered the swine, it drove them into the sea. I think, no other rational view can be taken of the subject; and all objections which may be urged against it, arise from overlooking the fact, that the New Testament writers speak in the above passages, according to the usual language of the day about *demons*. And be it observed, it is only when they speak of the supposed influence of *demons* in men, that they speak as in the preceding passages. In connection with doctrines they speak of them as *idols* as mere *nonentities*.

I am aware it may be said — why did not our Lord speak of *demons* according to the truth about them, and not in the popular language of the day, which is so apt to mislead us? No one, I answer, need to be mislead, if he attends to the plain instructions of the Bible about *demons*, *evil spirits*, etc., as I have attempted to show. Had the writers of the New Testament, not spoken of common events in the common language of their day, how could they have been understood? And to have corrected all the false notions of people and their false language, would have been an endless and vain task. If speaking of *demons* as they sometimes did, be found fault with, why not extend it to other things? Why did our Lord speak

of transmigration as true, and allow his disciples to do it, without correcting them. See John ix. 1—3; Math. xvi. 13, 14. But why not blame ourselves, for every day we speak in the common language of our day and not according to the truth of things. Most people would smile at our affectation if we did not.

James ii. 19. "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the demons also believe and tremble." James wrote to believing Jews, chap. i. 1. And it is obvious from the context, that he was reasoning against some of them, who said they had faith but had not works to prove it. Here he reasons with them on their own admitted principles concerning the demons. They believed, demons were the souls of wicked men, and were in torment after death. To expose their false profession, and convince them that it was vain, James says—"thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well." This he commends. But he adds—"the demons also believe," and so far they are equal to you. But the demons not only believe, but also "tremble," and their faith shows itself by their works, and in this they excel you. Your faith does not produce works, but theirs do, and they condemn you on your own principles. The demon's faith is not dead, but yours is dead, "for know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead." It seems to me obvious, that James is not here teaching or approving what they believed about demons, but refuting their pretensions to faith, from their own opinions concerning demons. He does not admit their opinions true, but reasons with them on their believing them to be true. He said they did well in believing "that there is one God." But he does not say, they did well in believing that "the demons also believe and

tremble." But why not commend them for this if it was true?

This view of the passage, appears to me agreeable to the context, for in the remainder of the chapter James goes on to refute their false profession by showing that Abraham's faith proved itself by works. He also shows that Rahab's faith was proved by works, and concludes thus—"for as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." But let it be supposed, that James here teaches, that demons are evil spirits, or, the souls of dead men, what then? It follows that they believe, and that they also tremble in a future state. But it also follows, that this is the only text in the Bible where these opinions are taught. Where else do we read of any kind of demons either believing or trembling in such a state? This is not even said of the demons which were supposed to possess men and torment them. And if any demons had cause to tremble, certainly they had. But I do not find, that they were even threatened with any punishment, either in this world or a future state. Is not this a strange admission, if demons were the souls of wicked men? And that this has been the belief of heathen, Jews, and many Christians, we have seen in the preceding investigation. But I ask, did Jews or Christians, derive such views from divine revelation respecting the torment of demons or the souls of the wicked after death? If from the Bible, in what place shall I find it? If they did not derive them from the heathen, all must admit, it was not for the want of opportunity, for such opinions prevailed among them.

If James in this passage, teaches the common notions about demons, that they are evil spirits, or the

souls of wicked men, who can reconcile his teaching with the other sacred writers in the many passages which have come under our consideration. We have seen, that they denounce all demons, and declare them to be nothings in the world. And not until the Babylonian captivity, did the Jews learn that demons were anything else. Before this, they worshipped demons, and for which God reproved and punished them. But not a hint is given, that demons were real beings of any kind, or could do good or evil to any one. By whose authority then were demons transformed into real beings, evil beings, and that a whole legion of them could enter into one man? And must we believe on one solitary verse in the Epistle of James, that demons believed and trembled. Before I can do this, I must see how my views of this verse can be proved erroneous.

In the preceding examination we have seen, that demons and unclean spirits express the same thing. A few texts remain, where the last phrase occurs, in which demons are not mentioned. A few words on them may suffice. Mark i. 27; iii. 27, and Luke vii. 21, we may pass without any remarks. The others I shall very briefly notice. In Acts v. 16, it is said, that among other sick folks, brought to be cured by the Apostles, were brought some, "vexed with unclean spirits; and they were healed every one." If unclean spirits mean demons here, as in other texts, nothing is said about casting them out, but that the persons "were healed." And is not this a confirmation, that casting out demons and healing persons supposed to be possessed with demons, only meant the same thing? When the person was healed, it was concluded that the demon had gone out of him. Why? because the

disease was ascribed to the demon as the cause of it, and both went out together.

In Acts viii. 5—8 we are told, Philip went to Samaria, preached there, and wrought miracles. "Unclean spirits, crying with loud voice came out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame were healed." The unclean spirits here, mean demons as in other texts, from the persons being said to be possessed with them. And when it is said they cried out, we ought to understand the persons cried out as seen above, and not the demons or unclean spirits. No further remarks seem to be necessary on this text.

Acts xvi. 16—19. Please read the passage. It is said, "a certain damsel was possessed with a spirit of divination," or, of Python as in the margin; that is of Apollo. There were many in the heathen world who practised divination, and some were supposed to have in them demons which prophesied. They were called Pythons, from Apollo Pythias, one of the principal prophesying demons, whose priestess at Delphi, was from him called Pythia. This damsel was supposed to be inspired with the spirit of this dead man. The account of her, is told in the language of the times, and as the heathen would have spoken about her. Some have thought that Apollo Pythias refers to Python, a famous ventriloquist, and that this damsel deceived people by her practice of this art. Others, derive the name from "*peten* serpent, which was an animal particularly respected by the heathen in their divinations, as being to them an emblem or representative of the solar light, or, Apollo, their divining God." The damsel referred to in this passage, like all the heathen prophetesses, seemed under their in-

spiration to be mad, and this is countenanced by her following Paul for many days, &c. She was probably a fortune-teller, and imposed on people by the art of ventriloquism, for by this art the woman at Endor imposed on Saul. Such persons were said to have a familiar spirit and consulted with the dead, and one of them divined to Saul the issue of an impending battle. But all such impostors were condemned and banished the land of Israel.

Acts xix. 13—17. Please also read this passage, and observe, that the facts related took place at Ephesus, a place famous for using curious arts, and having books relating to them. See verses 18, 19. Verse 12 says, "evil spirits" went out of some, by parts of Paul's clothing being brought to them. Among the users of the curious arts at Ephesus, there were "certain vagabond Jews, exorcists," and Sceva a Jew, had seven sons who appear to have been of the number. They attempted to expel demons and cure diseases by charms, scents, the sounds of certain Hebrew words, &c." If you exorcise, says Justin against Trypho in the name of any of your kings, or just men, or prophets, or patriarchs, none of the demons will obey you : but if indeed any of you exorcise by the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, probably he will obey you." The sons of Sceva, finding Paul more successful in casting out evil spirits by the name of Jesus, attempted doing it in the same way, and on a man who was deranged. But the evil spirit, or the madness in the man we should think led him to say—"Jesus I know and Paul I know but who are ye." But how did he know all this? Probably by Paul's success in casting out evil spirits in Jesus name, or restoring madmen to a sound mind, while the attempts of the sons of Sceva

failed. That this man was insane, and furious, is evident from his treatment of these impostors : see v. 16. The account ends without informing us whether Paul healed this maniac, but we are told—"Many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men : And they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver. So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed."

We have now finished our examination of the Bible on the subject of demons, evil spirits, etc. etc. We are not aware, that a single text has been overlooked in our investigation. Our object has been, to ascertain what the Scriptures teach us, and how we have succeeded must be left to the decision of the reader. Our investigation has been brief, for our limits did not permit us to enlarge. But enough has been said to lead the reader to reflection, and further examination of the subject. Much has been left out which we wished inserted, and may be used should our attention be again called to the discussion of it.

In confirmation of the views we have advanced, a number of facts might be added. But I shall only name a few of them in a brief manner. Several of them have been hinted at already in the course of our remarks. 1. The doctrine of demons was not introduced among the Jews by divine revelation, but by the heathen that surrounded them. It came first among them by their sacrificing to their gods, as we have seen from passages in the Old Testament. Nothing can be more certain than this, that it had a heathen origin among them, and when introduced, was condemned by God in their Scriptures. No Old Testament writer gives the least countenance to the

doctrine of demons, or the worship of them ; nor, is a single hint given, that they were real beings, or had ever been so. And as to persons being possessed with demons, not a vestige of evidence respecting this is to be found in all the Old Testament. It begins and ends, without any allusion to such a thing. The case of Saul is no exception to this, as has been seen above. The Old Testament prophets performed miraculous cures on persons, but not one of them is ever said—"cast out demons." Nor in Moses laws, laws, were any rites of purification prescribed, for such as had demons cast out of them, although this was done for persons cured of the leprosy and other disorders. Besides the Old Testament prophets predicted, the miraculous cures which the Messiah should perform when he appeared. See Isaiah chap. 35 and other passages. But not one of them intimates, that he was to cast out demons, evil spirits, or the ghosts of dead men. But how could they overlook this, if the possessions in the New Testament, were real possessions of such beings, for their casting them out is represented as the most wonderful work of Christ ?

2. It is also a fact, that the doctrine of demons, and men being possessed with them, was not a new revelation given to the world by the New Testament writers. We read of demons in the Old Testament, but of no one being possessed with them. But, when many read the New Testament concerning possessions of demons, they conclude that this must be a new revelation from God to mankind. This is a great mistake, for in Egypt, Chaldea, Greece, and other heathen countries, demons were well known, and also of persons being possessed with them. In India this was also well known in the days of Christ. And all must here notice, that the New Testament never

speaks of demons, or of persons being possessed with them, as a new or strange thing. They are introduced, and spoken about like other common things of the day. It is not demons, or the possession of them, that is spoken about with surprise, but the Saviour's casting of them out. This is mentioned as a most extraordinary event, for it was never done before as he performed it. Before his day, demons were common, were cast out, or pretended to be cast out of persons, as could easily be shown by abundant testimony. And this was even done in Judea in the days of Solomon, and down to the days of Josephus if he may be credited. And that other persons cast out demons, or cured persons supposed to be possessed with them, there is abundant testimony in proof of it were it disputed.

3. It is also a fact, that demons were considered the ghosts, or the souls of dead wicked men. The quotations from Parkhurst, Enfield, and others abundantly prove this. But, do either Old or New Testament writers sanction this as true? Nothing like this is to be found in their writings. Nor, do they describe them as real beings of any kind whatever. But admit them to be the souls of dead wicked men, and what follows? It follows, that the souls of wicked men in ancient times, were not sent to hell as many have believed, but took up their abode in the bodies of men to torment them. Souls surely could not be in two such different places at once? And if it is said, they carried their hell about with them wherever they went, is to tell us, that hell changes with the times, and any new use which men may have for it. But no such notions are to be found in the Bible, for this would make it a book which changes with the changing opinions of men.

4. Another fact is certain, that we never read in the Scriptures, of the souls of dead good men, taking possession of any persons, whether pious or profane. But why not? Is it not as rational to conclude, that good men's souls would do this, as the souls of wicked men? And might we not expect, that God would so far permit good men's souls to take up their abode in the same bodies with the souls of wicked men, as to counteract their evil influence upon them? It is not much to the honor of God's character to permit the one, without also permitting the other. And if this was admitted as true, then souls both good and bad, neither go to hell or heaven after death, but stay in our world to do good and evil to mankind. But will people in our day, give up their views of hell or heaven? One of the two must be done, for to believe the popular opinions about demons, and also about hell and heaven seems to be impossible, unless we are determined to credit the most palpable contradictions.

5. But it is also a fact, that the Scripture writers do not speak as men have done, and some do now, about the souls of either good or bad men after death. The heathen sent the souls of wicked men to *Tartarus* after death, and the souls of good men to *Elysium*. But where did they learn such notions? Not from the Bible, but from their own vain imaginations. The Jews, and others, sent all good and bad to *sheol* or *hades*. But some divided this place into two parts, the one for the good and the other for the wicked. But does the Bible do this? No, is it not rather an alteration, or improvement on the heathen opinions respecting their Tartarus and Elysium? And pray, what great improvement have modern Christians made on the ancient heathens, for their

hell is pretty much the same as theirs. Some make a heaven for good souls before the resurrection of the dead, compounded of heathen opinions and Scripture statements of immortality to man promised after it. But, if we are to leave behind us the Bible in one thing, and embrace heathen opinions, at what point are we to stop? Why not believe in their doctrine of *demons* in all its breadth and length. And why not advocate, that persons in our day are possessed with demons as in ancient times? Why should we not say, that a wild maniac has a legion of demons in him?

We intended to have stated more facts, in confirmation of the views we have advanced; and, also noticed some objections, which might be made against them. But we must close for the present. In conclusion we remark, that we have with some care, examined the Scriptures to know, what is meant by the terms *satan, devil,* and *demons.* We have stated the result of our examination, and rise from it with the fullest conviction, that the common opinions entertained on these subjects have no foundation in the Bible. Let a false idea be attached to words in one country and age, and however superstitious it may be, it will descend to posterity; let it once take root in men's minds, and who can calculate to what extent it will grow, and to how many generations it will descend as an inheritance to their children?

God has given to men a revelation of his will, to guide them both as to faith and practice. Their wisdom and happiness consists in holding fast the faithful word and obeying it, without alteration or addition. Who ever altered or added to it, and thereby promoted the glory of God, his own good, and the happiness of mankind?

INDEX

OF PARTICULAR TEXTS ILLUSTRATED.

	Page.
Gen. iii.	19, 213
xxvi. 21	35
Deut. xvii. 7	363
Numb. xxii. 22, 32	363
Deut. xxxii. 17	360
Judges ix. 23	366
1 Samuel xxix. 4	37
xvi.	366
2 Samuel xix. 22	38
xxiv. 1	41
1 Kings v. 4	38
xi. 14—25	39
1 Chron. xxi. 1	40
Ezra iv. 6	42
Job chap. i. and ii.	43
xxxi. 33	22
Psalms ix. 5	234
" lxxi. 13	61
" xc. 2	349
" xcvi. 5, 6	361
" cvi. 37	362
" cix.	61
" cxxxvi.	225
Isaiah xiii. 21	362
" xxxiii. 14	234
" lxv. 11	263
Jer. xvii. 4	233
xxiii. 39, 40	233
Daniel xii	234, 250
Hosea vi. 7	23
Zach. iii. 1, 2	62
" xiii. 2	369
Mal. i. 4	234
Matt. iv. 1—12	24, 146, 392
" vi. 13	162
" viii. 16	394
" viii. 28—34	404
Micah 5. 2. (210)	
Matt. ix. 32—35	397
" xi. 18	389
" xii. 22—31	398
" xii. 31, 32	287
" xiii. 36—42	136, 271
" xv. 21—29	402
" xvi. 23	98
" xvii. 14—22	400
" xviii. 8	335
" xix. 27—29	296
" xxiv. and xxv.	136, 250, 252, 308
" xxviii. 20	277
Mark i. 23—29	401
" iii. 23	99
" iii. 22—28	401
" iv. 15	157
" v. 1—21	404
" vii. 24—31	402
" ix. 14—30	400
Luke iv. 35, 36	401
" viii. 2, 3	394
" 26—40	404
" ix. 37—43	400
" x. 18	100
" xi. 14—27	397
" xiii. 6	101
" xxii. 31, 32	99
" xxii. 3	104
John vi. 70	117
" viii. 44	124
" x. 20, 21	388
" xii. 31	167
" xiii. 2, 27	117, 104
" xiv. 30	167
" xvi. 8—12	167
Acts v. 3	106

Acts viii. 5—18 412
" x. 38 138
" xiii. 10 135
" xvi 16—19 402
" xix. 15—17 413
" xvii. 18 386
" xxvi. 18 107
Rom. v. 12—14 23
" vii. 7—11 27
" xvi. 20 108
1 Cor. v. 5 108
" vii. 5 110
" x. 11, 20, 21, 280, 384
" chap. xv 23, 261
2 Cor. ii. 11 110
" iv. 4, 17, 18 171, 263
" chap. v 263
" xi. 3, 14 22, 165, 111
" xii. 7 112
Eph. i. 21 287
" ii. 2, 7 171, 253
" iii. 21 265
" iv. 27 139
" vi. 11 139
Colossians i. 26 254
1 Thess. iii. 5 164
2 Thess. i. 9 323
" ii. 9, 18 112
1 Tim. i. 17, 20 110, 249
" ii. 13, 14 23, 29
" iii. 11 116
" iv. 1 387
" v. 15 113
2 Tim. ii. 24—26 141
" iii. 3, 6 117, 141
Titus i. 2 266
" ii. 3 16
Heb. ii. 5, 14, 15 132, 286
" vi. 2, 5 337, 286
" ix. 26 280
" xi. 3 265
James i. 15 30
" ii. 19 409
" iv. 7 142
1 John iii 8—10 129
Jude, verses 7, 9, 13 143, 335, 337
Rev. ii. 9, 10, 13, 24 113, 145, 114
" iii. 9 113
" xviii. 2 386
" ix. 20 386
" xii. 9 158
" xiv. 11 342
" xvi. 14 386

ERRATA.

Page 39, 8 line from bottom, for "the in" read "in the."
Page 42, in 12th line from the bottom, for xxvi. 1. read xxi v 1.
Page 267, 4th line from top, for "finite," read "infinite."

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01004 7597